

**BALRAJ MADHOK**  
**ON**

**INDIA'S FOREIGN**  
**POLICY &**  
**NATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**(Collection of some  
important speeches  
delivered in the Lok  
Sabha)**





*Baldev Prasad*

**Madhok on  
India's Foreign Policy  
And National Affairs**

### **Other works by the same author**

1. Kashmir Centre of New Alignments
2. Indian Nationalism
3. Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherji—A Biography

### **In Hindi**

4. Bharat Aur Sansar
5. Bharat Ki Suraksha
6. Bhartiya Rajniti
7. Jeet ya Haar (Novel)

**Balraj Madhok on**  
**India's Foreign Policy**  
**&**  
**National Affairs**

**(Collection of some important speeches  
delivered in the Lok Sabha)**



**Bharati Sahitya Sadan, New Delhi.**  
CC-0. Nanaji Deshmukh Library, BJP, Jammu. Digitized by eGangotri

---

**Publishers** : Bharati Sahitya Sadan,  
30/90 Connaught Circus,  
New Delhi-1.

**Distributors** : New Light Publishers, Rajinder  
Nagar, New Delhi.

**Edition** : First (January, 1969)

**Cover Design** : Pal Bandhu

**Price** : Rupees Three only

**Printers** : Ajay Printers, Delhi-32.



## Publisher's Note

We have the pleasure of bringing out this collection of some of the speeches delivered by Prof. Balraj Madhok in the House of Representatives (Lok Sabha) of the Indian Parliament during the last eighteen months.

Prof. Madhok is not only a leading spokesman of Bhartiya Jan Sangh (Indian Peoples Party)—a party in the making of which he has played a major role since its inception and which emerged as the second biggest Political Party in India in terms of votes polled and seats won during the fourth General Elections of 1967 which were fought by it under his leadership as President of the Party—but is also a recognised tribune of the nationalist people in general and the intellectual elite in particular in the Indian Parliament.

Since Foreign Affairs, Defence and Education are the special subjects of Prof. Madhok, most of the speeches chosen for this collection pertain to these three vital spheres of national policy. The speeches regarding foreign policy include, besides a general survey of the Indian Foreign Policy and the lines on which Prof. Madhok would like it to be reorientated, those dealing with specific subject, like India and the Commonwealth, Indian attitude regarding West and East Germany in the context of general principles about recognition of states and the Indian reaction to Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia. The two speeches on Kutch—the opening speech on the no-confi-

dence motion moved by Prof. Madhok and his reply to the debate—deal primarily with the vital question of Indo-Pak relations.

Defence policy is covered by the two speeches—one on the reorganisation of North Eastern Region in the light of developments in Assam and the other on the Border Security Bill. Prof. Madhok has dealt with the question of national security in general in relation to the wrong notions about secularism prevailing in the ruling circles of India which have become a major hindrance in the way of formulation of a realistic defence and border policy.

Education is covered by two speeches, one on the general question of a National Policy on Education and the other dealing with some specific problems of education in India.

Economic issues are covered by the first speech in the collection which being the speech on the President's address on the opening of the Parliament after the Fourth General Elections, is not confined to any one subject, as also by a speech on Industrial Policy delivered during the debate on Prof. Hazari's report on the subject and a speech on automation with reference to its effect on employment potential.

The other speeches deal with such important subjects as the language problem, the question of Privy purses to the Ex-rulers of the erstwhile princely States and the question of Kashmir which is getting more and more complicated because of the indecision of powers that are in New Delhi.

The speeches regarding Privy Purses, language problems and the security problem in S.P. were originally delivered

in Hindi. Their rendering in English has been done by Prof. Madhok himself.

We are confident that in view of the importance and wide range of the subjects covered and the place and stature of Prof. Madhok in public life of India, this collection will be helpful to general readers as also to foreign students of Indian affairs in understanding the political mind of nationalist India.

—*Publishers*



## CONTENTS

National Government	...	9
India's Foreign Policy		
Needs Reorientation	...	20
Rape of Czechoslovakia	...	38
India and the Commonwealth	...	46
India and Germany	...	51
Betrayal on Kutch-1	...	57
Betrayal on Kutch-2	...	74
India's Industrial Policy	...	84
Automation and Unemployment	...	95
The Language Problem	...	100
National Policy on Education	...	106
Education—Some Concrete		
Suggestions	...	119
Privy Purses	...	132
Kashmir	...	136
North East Region	...	140
Security and Secularism	...	148



# National Government

[Based on speech in Hindi on 21. 3. 1967,  
the opening day of the New Parliament.]

We are meeting here in this House for the first time after the completion of the 4th General Elections. The Rashtrapati has formally opened the Parliament and read his Address to us. The Presidential speech mirrors the mind of the Government. Therefore if we criticise it, it is not the criticism of the President. We are thankful to the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, for his address and pray for his long life. But I am sorry that we cannot agree with what the Government has put in his mouth.

The address makes a reference to the elections that have just been completed. Our people deserve congratulations for the robust commonsense and the political maturity that they displayed in these elections.

The people have shown that democracy has taken deep roots in India and have thereby raised the prestige of India in the democratic world. But I regret that I cannot congratulate the Government for this superb performance of our people. The Government tried to spoil the elections through irregularities and misuse of power wherever it could. Jammu and Kashmir state had a special share in such irregularities.....

## **The Kashmir Problem :**

The question of Jammu and Kashmir State is not a party question. It is an indivisible part of India and

shall remain so. But it is a matter of regret that Congress Government has been so far treating it as its domestic question. I would appeal to the Government not to handle the Kashmir issue on partisan lines. I remember those days of 1953 when late Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerji had written to Late Pt. Nehru that they should sit down round a table and find a lasting solution of the Kashmir problem. In reply Pt. Nehru had written him that that would not serve any useful purpose because there were basic differences in their approach and points of view. Dr. Mookerji then wrote back, "May be our points of view differ but there is one thing common between you and me. Both of us are sons of Bharat Mata and as such we can meet and find a solution for the problem which is common for both of us." I would repeat the same appeal to the Prime Minister today. We can have our differences. I too agree that Kashmir issue is a complicated question. That is why I want you not to treat it as a domestic question of yours. Let us all sit down to discuss this problem. We all want Kashmir to remain an integral part of India and it will remain so. But the mis-conceptions that are being spread about the Kashmir question all over the world must be removed. But that cannot be done in the way you are going about it. Very hopeful conditions had arisen in Kashmir before the general elections. For the first time a democratic opposition party had emerged in Kashmir Valley. Had there been free elections, both the parties there would have vied with each other in proving to be nearer to the rest of India. That would have created a situation which would have served wider Indian interests very well. It would have helped in normalising the conditions



in Kashmir and would have raised the prestige of India in the world. But I am sorry to say that that opportunity was not availed of. Even now it is not too late to mend things. I assure the Prime Minister and the Congress Government full co-operation of my party if they take the initiative to rectify past mistakes and settle the Kashmir issue once for all.

### **The Economic Problems :**

A reference has been made to the food problem also in the President's Address. It has been admitted that there is a crisis on the food front but a promise has been held out that the country would become self-sufficient in food by 1970 and that we will not take any foreign aid after 1976. But do the Government think that the people of this country will allow them to remain in power till 1970 or 1976? They will not be allowed to remain in power upto 1976 or even upto 1971. Even if they manage to remain in power till 1971. They will not be able to make the country self-sufficient in food so long as they continue the policies that they have been pursuing so far. Late Pandit Nehru had assured the country that India will not only not import foodgrains after the First five-year plan but will be in a position to export food. But because the policies were wrong our food imports which were to the tune of two million tons a year at the time of First five-year plan, have since increased many-fold. Therefore, it should be clear that this problem is not going to be solved on the basis of claims and slogans. Policies will have to be changed if we want to solve this problem. That demands that first we should have a clear understanding of the causes of the problem. We must first

know the malady, diagnose it well, before we can find a remedy for it.

India's economic problem is three-fold. The first of them is backwardness of our agriculture, which is our basic industry and on which more than 70% of our people depend and which we have neglected all these years.

Our second major economic problem is unemployment. Unemployment is growing in India because of our blind imitation of the USA and Russia. They have excess of land and Capital and have shortage of labour. Therefore their economy is capital intensive. We are short of capital and land but have excess of manpower. But we copy those who are short of men and have excess of capital. We do not have capital, we go abegging for it all over the world. We have plenty of men. But we import electronic computers from outside, fit them in our offices and retrench our men working there. There is neither any rationale nor morality in this policy. I would submit that the Government should do some re-thinking on this.

Our third problem is the continuous rise in prices and they will continue to rise so long as the policies, of which this phenomenon is the result, are not changed. One major cause of rise in prices is the instability in the prices of foodgrains. The prices of foodgrains are the barometer of prices in India. So long as the prices of food are not stabilized there can be no stability in the prices of other things and so long as we do not increase our food production there can be no stability in our food prices.

The second factor for the rise in prices is the imbalance between the money and goods available in the



market. Production has not increased or has increased at a very slow rate. But on the other hand there is a continuous flow of rupees in the market. Already, as Shri Hanumanthaiya has pointed out just now, notes worth 4200 crores are in the market and this quantity is continuously increasing. Inflation is the result. Who is responsible for it? It is clear that monetary policies are responsible for this state of affairs. This inflation will have to be checked, wasteful expenditures will have to be stopped and production will have to be increased. So long as balance between goods available and money available in the market is not restored, the prices will not be stabilised. Until and unless we do this the prices will continue to rise in spite of our tall claims and slogans.

The spurt in prices is causing great hardship to the common people, particularly to those with fixed incomes. Those who live in Delhi are mostly Government servants or other such people as have fixed incomes. I know their plight. They can hardly make their both ends meet.

Housing is one of their major problems. The old Mughals had put up some palaces in this capital city. The Congress rulers are trying to establish their title for being called Later Mughals by putting up some other palatial buildings in it. But Delhi does not need palaces. It needs small houses for the common people. What have the Government done to that end? They have allotted 25 sq.-yard plots to large number of people to build their huts on them and thinks that they have done a great job. In this way it is creating new slums in the name of clearing old slums. Cannot this Government which can find crores for hotels and palaces, find ten or

fifteen crores of rupees for a Housing Corporation for Delhi, which may construct small houses costing five to seven thousands each to be given to the common people on hire purchase basis. Is it something impossible ? But the Government have little time to think about such things.

The reason is simple. Even though it talks of socialism actually it is a feudalistic Government. The people for it are not the common people of this country but a few special people. With this kind of attitude the economic problems of the country are getting aggravated. These problems cannot be solved through raising slogans and swearing by certain isms. We are concerned neither with socialism nor with capitalism nor with communism. Our sole concern is the people of this country and the problems that are facing them. The situation demands that we liberate ourselves from the four walls of slogans and isms and evolve realistic and nationalistic policies to suit our needs. So long as we do not become realists we cannot be true nationalists either. So long as we do not formulate our policies with an eye on our own conditions, realities and needs, we will not be able to solve our problems.

The President's Address contains a reference to the planning commission and Government's intention to reconstitute it. I welcome it. But what is important is the lines on which it will be reconstituted. An honourable member has suggested that the cabinet itself should act as the planning commission. It means nothing. I would suggest that the planning commission should consist of a few experts who should fix the priorities, prepare the cost estimates of different projects and the time schedule for their completion. The actual



task of executing these projects should be left to State Governments or the concerned ministries of the Central Government. The Planning Commission, as it is today, has become a state within a state and Government within a Government ; and the people constituting it have developed a vested interest in its continuation in the present form. These people will have to be removed and this Planning Commission will have to be scrapped. A small Planning Committee will have to be set up which might be able to consider the economic needs and plans of the country in a realistic and practical way free of all kinds of slogans and ideological inhibitions.

### **Foreign Policy :**

It has also been asserted in the President's Address that India's foreign policy has stood the test of time. I am not prepared to accept this assessment as correct. It is because of our faulty foreign policy that we were subjected to four armed aggressions during the last twenty years. Name any other country which had to suffer four invasions during such a short period ? It is because of our foreign policy that we could just scrap through in the recent elections to the Security Council of the UN even though it was our turn on the basis of regional understandings. And that too could be possible only with the help of Israel whom we look upon as our enemy. Had Israel not voted and canvassed for us, we could not have been elected. It is therefore blatantly wrong to say that our foreign policy has been successful. The truth is that we have no foreign policy at all. We have only slogans. And slogans can neither provide food for the hungry stomachs of our people nor can they provide a sound basis for our foreign policy. We, all the

time, keep talking of non-alignment and keeping out of power blocs. But the so-called blocs have melted or are melting away. The world situation has undergone a radical change. It is, therefore, time that we also re-think about our foreign policy. So long as USA and USSR were at daggers drawn, we could well say that we will not take sides with any of them. But now they themselves are coming nearer to each other.

Today it is we not they who are in the fray. Can we be non-aligned in our quarrels with Communist China? Can we be non-aligned in our conflict with Pakistan? Communist China has her own allies and so has Pakistan. We too will have to find friends and allies. Therefore, changed situation demands that the Government make a re-appraisal of their policies.

We should have an independent foreign policy based on national interests. We should enter into bilateral agreement with different countries irrespective of the bloc or blocs to which they may belong on the basis of reciprocity and mutuality of interests. If President Nasser of UAR claims to be neutral in our conflict with Pakistan, we will have to tell him that we are neutral in UAR's conflict with Israel. We should be friends of those who are friendly to us, enemy of those who are inimical towards us. We should be neutral towards those who want to remain neutral in disputes in which we are involved. This should be the basis of our foreign policy. The foreign policy that we have been pursuing so far has been conducive neither to our self-respect nor helpful in finding friends and allies for us. Such a policy will have to be changed.

### **Defence Needs and Reorganisation of Assam :**

CC-0. Nandini Dashmukh Library B.P. Jammu. Digitized by eGangotri



our defence. We are being pressurised to sign the Non-proliferation Treaty. We should not submit to such pressure. Today the countries which have developed atomic power want to hold the monopoly of it. They do not want any other country to join the nuclear club. It would be wrong for us to agree to their demand. We will have to equip our armed forces with the same kind of weapons which are possessed by our enemies. I would, therefore, urge upon the Government not to tie India's hands by signing the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Here again our policy and approach should be guided solely by our national interests.

The developments in our North Eastern region have an important bearing on our national defence. We are trying to pursue a policy of appeasement towards Nagas and Mizo rebels. This policy of appeasement will not pay. It will not lead to the solution of the problems posed by these rebels. We must adopt a policy of firmness towards them.

The talk of re-organization of Assam and the Eastern region is also in the air. I am not opposed to reorganization. But it is not something which can be taken in hand every second day. If you are serious about it, then first appoint a commission which should include some defence specialists besides administrators and others. The entire eastern region including Assam, NEFA, Manipur, Nagaland and Tripura should be brought within the purview of this commission. While giving due weight to the local feelings, aspirations and developmental needs of different areas, it must give proper consideration to the defence needs of the country as a whole. Defence considerations must come first in any plan of reorganisation of the border regions. This again

18 INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY & NATIONAL AFFAIRS  
is not a party question. The Prime Minister should evolve a policy in this regard in consultation with all the parties.

### **Plea for a Government of all Talents :**

Before I close, I would like to make one final submission. Today you are in power. But nobody can say as to how long will you be able to retain it. You have secured less than 40% of the polled votes in the last general election. Over 60% votes were polled by the Opposition parties. You might think that every one of your 52 Ministers can carry with him four or five votes in the parliament and so you can run the Government. Playing cards also have 52 cards and a house can be made with those cards as well. But just as the house of fifty-two cards falls down at the first jerk, your Government of 52 ministers is not going to last long.

I would, therefore, appeal to you to rise above the partisan considerations. You have a party and so have I. But the country is greater than the Congress Party or the Jan Sangh Party. Let us formulate our policies with an eye on the country and the nation. If our policies will be determined by the National interests they will be able to solve the problems facing the country and the people. It is not important whether your interests are served or not, my interests are served or not. What is important is whether the policies we pursue serve the interests of the people or not. It is a matter of shame for us all that even after twenty years of freedom our people suffer from hunger and poverty. Many of them have not even cloths to cover their body. If you cannot change this situation then you must get out of the way and create an opportunity for others to take over.

CC-0. In the Public Domain. Digitized by eGangotri

co-operation with all. The circumstances and conditions in the country today demand that there should be a Government of all talents which may tackle the problems before the country on the basis of collective leadership and collective thinking in the wider interests of the nation.



# India's Foreign Policy Needs Reorientation

[Full text of the speech in the Parliament (Lok Sabha) during the debate on the demands for the Ministry of External Affairs on 16-7-1967]

Just now an honourable member from the Congress benches said that their foreign policy has stood the test of time. It has really stood the test of time as it is because of this foreign policy that our country was invaded four times during the last twenty years and the fifth invasion is in the offing. If that is the success of our foreign policy. I do not know what is meant by failure.

The right to conduct foreign relations is an attribute of sovereignty and India could have a foreign policy only when it became free. Prior to that, the Congress did pass resolutions on foreign policy but they were the result of the demagogy of Pandit Nehru who used to make personal comments on foreign affairs and the great leaders like Sardar Patel and Mahatma Gandhi used to wink over them as the play things of a playboy. I do not think they could be the basis of the foreign policy of a free country.

The foreign policy of a free country has to be guided primarily by national interests. The considerations that have been guiding it—platitudes like world peace, Panchsheel, charity, etc., have no place in the foreign policy, and even this talk of non-alignment



which has become the sacred Mantram of our foreign policy is also not relevant today. The foreign policy is a policy ; it is not a principle. So far as non-alignment is concerned, every country in the world has to be both non-aligned and aligned. In the disputes of others, in which we are not directly involved, we have to be non-aligned ; we should be non-aligned. We should not go and poke our nose everywhere. But in other matters, where our interests are involved, where we are fighting, we have to find our friends. Every country in the world is both aligned and non-aligned. Even countries like USSR and USA which can afford to be non-aligned, which are so strong, and which can go alone, even they are aligned. Russia is in the Warsaw Pact and America is in the Cento and Seato. The great non-aligned friend, Nassar of UAR, has also military pacts with Iraq and Syria. Therefore, this fetish about non-alignment must go. India needs to be non-aligned in the quarrel between Russia and America, estrangement between whom is now fortunately disappearing. We should be non-aligned in the quarrel between Arabs and Israel. But there, we have not remained non-aligned. But, when we are fighting with Pakistan and China, we cannot be non-aligned. We need friends, Pakistan has friends and China has friends and we also need friends. And therefore, we must be very clear as to what we mean by non-alignment.

The foreign policy of any country has to be primarily guided by three things : its geopolitical situation ; its need for security and the attitude of its immediate neighbours. The attitude of its immediate neighbours and its relationship with the immediate neighbours is the main guiding factor in the foreign policy of any

country. Our immediate neighbours are Pakistan and China.

What is our policy towards Pakistan ? Pakistan is our born enemy. The very existence of Pakistan, depends upon keeping up tension with India. If Pakistan learns to live in peace with India, then the very *raison d'etere* for existence of Pakistan as a separate State will disappear. And, therefore, whoever may be the ruler of Pakistan he will keep up tension with India.

Kashmir is not the cause of tension with Pakistan. It is the result of that tension. Even if we give 10 Kashmirs to Pakistan, even if we give away Delhi to Pakistan, even then, Pakistan will remain our enemy. It is this basic fact about Pakistan which we should keep in mind. We must also remember the character of Pakistan. You cannot deal with a man, you cannot deal with a country without understanding the character of that person, or that country. The rulers of Pakistan are bullies. That is their character. That is born out of their inferiority complex. The other day, Mahant Digvijay Nath said that because of the military and economic pressure, some of the weaker elements of Hindus became converts to Islam and somebody objected to that statement. But that is a historical fact. To cover that inferiority complex, they indulge in bullyism. This bullyism and goondaism of Pakistan's rulers has paid them dividends. They got Pakistan by adopting that policy towards the Congress. The same policy they are continuing to pursue towards India. If we look into the Indo-Pakistan relations for the last 20 years, we will find that this goondaism and bullyism has paid them rich dividends. When they attacked India in 1947, they got some 40,000 sq. miles of our territory in return. They again scored



over India in respect of the canal waters plus about Rs. 80 crores in the bargain. When they attacked our territory—Lathitilla and Dumabari border—they got two villages. If a man knows that if he adopts an aggressive posture he gains something by it, then, why should he give up that posture? And that is why Pakistan is showing an aggressive posture. The only way to deal with Pakistan is to adopt a firmer and stronger policy. We know the character of Pakistanis. I come from that area. President Ayub belongs to a clan akin to that of mine. In Punjab, there is a saying about the Pakistani character which means, they have the front of a tiger and the back of a jackal. They are bullies and they are cowards. If we deal with them strongly, they will run away. But the difficulty is that the people who have been dealing with them on our side have proved to be congenital cowards. We do not need these congenital cowards. We have need to deal with Pakistan firmly and strongly. If Pakistan attacks one village, then, we must attack five of their villages. If they kill two Indians, then, let us kill 10 Pakistanis. Only then Pakistan will learn to behave. This is the only policy that we can adopt towards Pakistan.

But instead we are still talking about the Tashkent spirit. It is dead as dodo. I was reading the report of the Foreign Ministry, wherein they have said that we are doing this ; we are doing that. But clapping cannot be done with one hand alone. I say that Pakistan has buried the Tashkent agreement. Let us not talk about it. Let us not swear by it. Pakistan has to be dealt with in a different way : and that is, we must change our foreign policy towards Pakistan. We must



be firm and be reciprocal in all matters. That is the only way to deal with Pakistan.

We are told that since Pakistan has opened a second front for us through China and because we cannot fight on two fronts, therefore let us come to terms with Pakistan. That is the most foolish stand to take. If we make such a concession or submission to Pakistan, because Pakistan has made an alliance with China, Pakistan will realise that this policy of alliance with China has paid dividends, and it will strengthen that alliance ; it will not weaken that alliance. Therefore, any submission to Pakistan because of this alliance would be wrong. It will not serve any purpose. It will only have the opposite effect.

The only way to deal with Pakistan is that if Pakistan could open a second front, we also should open a second front for her. That brings us to the question of Pakhtoonistan. The question of Pakhtoonistan is a burning question. We have a moral duty towards the Pakhtoons and their great leader. The Pakhtoons have nothing to do with Pakistan. Afghanistan is the national State of Pakhtoons. The Pakhtoons want to have a separate State as part of Afghanistan. Some Pakhtoons have been brought under the control of Pakistan. They want to go back to their homeland. They will have to go back.

In this connection, I would like to quote Sir Kerr Fraser-Tytler, from his book on *Afghanistan*. He is not very friendly to India or Afghanistan and has a soft corner for Pakistan. This is what he says in that book :

**“Unfortunately, the Pathan races, which make up the ruling portion of the Afghan nation, have spilled over their mountain boundaries**

and spread down into the plains, so that in large areas of Pakistan dwell a people whose affinities are with Kabul, so far as they are with anybody, and not with Karachi. As it stands at present behind the artificial boundary of the Durand Line, Afghanistan is ethnographically, economically, and geographically an incomplete State."

So, without Pakhtoon areas of Pakistan, Afghanistan remains incomplete. The demand of the Pakhtoons is not a separatist demand. It is an irredentist demand. They must go back to their own motherland, and we must support them, and support Afghanistan, which never accepted the Pakhtoon area as being part of Pakistan. We must support the Pakhtoons in their claim to go back to their motherland, in every way; morally, materially—and in doing so we will only be doing our duty towards them. That will be a second front for Pakistan and that is the best policy that we can follow towards Pakistan. We have followed the present policy towards Pakistan for the last 20 years and we have seen the results. Let us change it now.

Now, let me come to China. Actually, China was never our neighbour on the north. Tibet was was our neighbour. Our northern frontiers were the Indo-Tibetan frontier. It was never an Indo-China frontier. But then, here again, our so-called traditional friendship with China was based on two things: cultural proximity, because China became Buddhist, and secondly, geographical distance because Tibet lay between China and India. Now, both of these have disappeared. Therefore, China today stands as a natural rival of India in the economic field, in the political field and in the military field. Our



great blunder in the case of China was that we allowed China to overrun Tibet : I would like to draw the attention of the House to a great document, a letter, written by the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, as early as 7th November, 1950, to the late Pandit Nehru, when Sardar Patel came to know about the Chinese invasion of Tibet. I crave your indulgence for reading it *in extenso*, because I think it is something which every Member of the House, irrespective of party affiliation, must ponder over coolly.

Sardar Patel, in his D.O. No. 821-DPM/-50 dated 7th November, 1950, said : (It is a long letter, and so I shall read only some relevant extracts) :

**“Their last telegramme to us is an act of gross discourtesy, not only in the summary way it disposes of our protest against the entry of Chinese forces into Tibet but also in the wild insinuation that our attitude is determined by foreign influences. It looks as though it is not a friend speaking in that language but a potential enemy”.**

It was on 7th November, 1950, that Sardar Patel was writing to the effect that China was behaving as a potential enemy. I wish that the people of India, the Parliament, the Congress Party, had heeded the advice of Sardar Patel at that time.

Then, Sardar Patel continues :

**“Recent and bitter history also tells us that Communism is no shield against imperialism and that Communists are as good or as bad as imperialists as any other. Chinese ambitions in this respect not only cover the Himalayan**



slopes on our side but also include important parts of Assam. They have their ambitions in Burma also. Burma has the added difficulty that it has no McMahon line round which to build up even the semblance of an agreement. Chinese irredentism and Communist imperialism are different from the expansionism of imperialism of the western powers. The former has a cloak of ideology which makes it ten times more dangerous. In the guise of ideological expansion lie concealed racial, national and historical claims. The danger from the north and north-east, therefore, becomes both Communist and imperialist."

Then he continues :

"In these circumstances, to make people alive to the new danger or to make them defensively strong is a very difficult task indeed, and that difficulty can be got over only by enlightened firmness, strength and a clear line of policy.

.....

Any faltering or lack of decisiveness in formulating our objectives or in pursuing our policy to attain those objectives is bound to weaken us and increase the threats which are so evident.

.....

Hitherto, the Communist Party of India has found some difficulty in contacting Communists abroad, or in getting supplies of arms, literature, etc. from them. They had to contend with difficult Burmese and Pakistan

**frontiers on the east or with the long seaboard. They shall now have a comparatively easy means of access to Chinese Communists and through them to other foreign Communists. Infiltration of spies, fifth columnists and Communists would now be easier. Instead of having to deal with isolated Communist pockets in Telangana and Warrangal we may have to deal with Communist threats to our security along our northern and north-eastern frontiers where for supplies of arms and ammunition, they can safely depend on Communist arsenals in China."**

This is what Sardar Patal wrote to Pandit Nehru on 7th November, 1950. Every word that he said has proved to be prophetic. I wish even now the Ruling Party, not only the Ruling Party but all the nationalist parties in India, heed these words of Sardar Patel and adopt a realistic policy.

What can be a realistic policy towards China ? The first thing is to see that Tibet gets back its freedom. There can be no greater falsehood, there can be no greater travesty of truth than to say that Tibet is part of China. Tibet was never a part of China. Tibet has an independent history of 2500 years. According to Tibetan Chronicle, the first independent king of Tibet was a son of India the son of Paranjit of Koshal who was a contemporary of Lord Buddha. They got the script from India, they got the religion from India, they had all the trade with India. In fact, if Tibet had any links commercially, economically, culturally or politically, they were only with India. Whatever link they had with China was because of the Manchu Em-



peror. The Manchu Emperor were religious followers of Dalai Lama. They looked upon Dalai Lama as their Guru. It was on that basis that some kind of relationship was established. But in 1911 when the Manchu Emperors were gone, when the Manchu dynasty was overthrown, immediately Dalai Lama said that their relationship was with the Manchus and now that the Manchu dynasty was gone they had no relationship with China. This is a historical fact. We have admitted that. Our relationship with Tibet is based on Lhasa Convention of 1904 and Simla Convention of 1914 and they are binding on us even today.

Therefore, we followed a wrong policy about Tibet. We should not have allowed the Chinese to go into Tibet. What is worse, we did a great blunder when we accepted Chinese suzerainty over Tibet under the agreement of 1954. But that agreement has never been worked by China. China has already repudiated that agreement. When they have repudiated the treaty it is no longer binding on us. Therefore, my appeal to you is, the first thing we have to do about China is that we must repudiate the treaty of 1954 and give back to the Tibetans the right of freedom. And we, as a neighbouring country, as a people who believe in freedom, as a people who believe in human rights, as a people who stand for oppressed peoples, must take up their case in the United Nations and outside. We must work for the freedom of Tibet. Until and unless Tibet is freed there can be no peace in Asia. I have here a statement made recently by H. H. the Dalai Lama wherein he says :

**"We firmly believe that for the lasting peace of Asia and of the world the two great nations,**



**India and China should remain at peace. But we also believe that unless Tibet is restored her freedom and created into a demilitarized zone that peace will not be achieved."**

If we want to have peace in Asia, if we want to have peace in this part of the world, it is necessary that Tibet must get back its freedom and Tibet should become a demilitarized zone between India and China. This must be the first objective of our foreign policy in regard to China. Secondly, we must break diplomatic relationship with China. It is no use maintaining it. Our Embassy there is not a window on China ; it is a prison for our diplomats. Let us close it. Thirdly, we should stop supporting China's entry into the United Nations, we should try and create closer relations with countries which are threatened by China. China is a big giant. China has always been an expansionist power. To deal with China we must have friends. To those who say that we and China are traditional friends, that we have never quarrelled, I must say that they are misinformed. The empires we had in S.E. Asia—the Champa Empire, the Sailendra Empire, the Shri Vijaya Empire, fought long and bitter wars with China. Therefore we must formulate a positive China policy and we must follow it. I know some of my honourable friends will not agree with this. They represent a lunatic fringe of India, they do not represent the people of India. Therefore, the saner people, honest people, democratic people, nationalist people of India who constitute the large majority of Indian population must formulate a positive policy and that policy we must implement with firmness and determination.

Our other neighbours are Nepal, Ceylon and Burma.

These are small countries but these countries are very important for us. These countries are very near to us. Nepal is nearest to us. But for some time she has drifted away from us, and gave permission to China to build Lhasa-Kathmandu Road. It was out of reaction. The King of Nepal came here but he did not get a good reception here. Later he was invited to China and was given a red carpet reception and he signed the treaty. Later on, when I went to Nepal I talked to the people who count. They felt that they had committed a mistake but they could not get out of it. Therefore, if these countries show some leaning towards China, countries like Nepal, Burma, Cambodia etc., it is not because they like China but because they have lost faith in India. Let India stand up to China and then all these countries will be with us and not with China. They know that China is an expansionist power, a dangerous barbarian. They would like very much to be with India.

Therefore, my submission is that we must try to develop closer relationship with Nepal, with Burma, Cambodia, Thailand, Ceylon and other countries of S.E. Asia. They are our own people. They are our kith and kin. They are culturally a part of us. But we must treat them as equals. We should give up our policy of 'big brother'. Treat them as equals and then you will see that they will be our closest friends. These neighbours we must befriend. This must be the first objective of our foreign policy. We must also pay greater attention to Japan and S. Korea. India in fact must learn to look to the Pacific instead of the Atlantic in the days to come.

Then I come to West Asia. I need not say much about



it because my honourable friend, Shri Masani has dilated upon this question in detail. I want only to refer to Shri Chagla's speech in the United Nations where he said :

**"To us, therefore, the philosophy of tolerance, peace and co-existence, is natural and the ideas of violence and war repugnant."**

I ask Mr. Chagla, where was this policy of co-existence when Nasser was threatening Israel with extinction. I wish he had remembered this thing at that time. If you really stand for co-existence then you must reverse your policy about West Asia. We do not want to stand with Israel. We do not want to stand with the Arabs. We want to follow your policy, the policy of non-alignment, in West Asia, just as the Arabs followed a policy of non-alignment in our dispute with Pakistan, in our dispute with China. We want to be friendly with Israel. We want to be friendly with UAR. But we cannot give the right of veto to UAR, to decide as to who others can or cannot be the friends of India. Just as Nasser says : "I am a good friend of India and at the same time I am a good friend of Pakistan, a good friend of China," similarly, we should tell Nasser : "We are good friends of you but we are good friends of Israel also."

Had we had diplomatic relations with Israel we would not have been misled. Shrimati Indira Gandhi said on 7th June here that they could not think that a war was coming and therefore they could not evacuate our troops from Gaza. Had we had a window in Tel Aviv we could have known that war was coming. Actually I did tell the Foreign Minister that it seemed to me that war was coming. It is argued that Israelis killed our soldiers.

CC-0. Nanaji Deshmukh Library, BJP, Jammu. Digitized by eGangotri



Is that true ? Hold an enquiry. Is it not that UAR put its guns at a place near our camp ? Is it not a fact that three of our soldiers in a jeep were killed by a mine laid by UAR, the so-called friendly country ? Let us, therefore, not blame Israel. It was our fault. If anybody is responsible for the murder of our 14 jawans, it is the Government of India, the Defence Minister of India and the Prime Minister of India. They are primarily responsible for the murder of 14 of our young jawans. Why could you not evacuate them ? Is money more important than the lives of our jawans ?

If Canada could airlift 800 members of her forces why could we not evacuate our jawans and save them from death ? Therefore, it is no use blaming Israel or UAR if their shells and mines killed 14 of our jawans. We have to blame ourselves.

I want to say one thing more about West Asia. We talk of the Arab world. There are 13 Arab States but there is no Arab unity. We must deal with every Arab State, as with any other State, in the world, on bilateral basis. Jordan is our enemy ; I refuse to treat Jordan as our friend. Syria is our enemy ; I refuse to accept Syria as our friend. Saudi Arabia is our enemy ; I refuse to accept it as our friend. They all supported Pakistan. UAR was neutral and I want to be neutral towards UAR. Therefore, deal with every Arab State on a bilateral basis, and the basis should be reciprocity and mutuality of interest. Reciprocity and mutuality of interest could be the only basis of any worthwhile foreign policy. Let us not talk of the Arab world. There is no such thing as an Arab world.

The diplomatic recognition that we have given to

the Arab League must be withdrawn. The representative of that organisation has been doing mischief in this country. He has been instigating the Arab students to break our Indian laws. This must not be tolerated. He must be kicked out. We must not recognise the Arab League. You must know the country's opinion, the public opinion. Now you are completely cut off from it. You are more cut off from Indian public opinion than the British rulers of the past. That is another aspect. Therefore, I would appeal to you that you should review your policy in regard to West Asia.

Then, about the two big powers, USA and USSR. I have to say that we should try to be friendly with them. We should not rub them the wrong way. But, at the same time, let us not depend on them too much. None of them wants India to become a great power in its own right. Whenever they give us help, they take the price for it. America helped us and got the price in the devaluation of the rupee. Russia helped us and got the price in the form of the Tashkent Agreement. What are Russian newspapers and her "Radio Peace and Progress" doing? They are interfering in our internal affairs. They are boosting Kamaraj and Indira Gandhi, condemning Shri Morarji Desai and Shri S.K. Patil. I do not hold any brief for Shri Morarji Desai, nor have I any enmity for Shrimati Indira Gandhi. But how is it that a friendly foreign country in this blatant and ugly way, is interfering in the internal affairs of our country? Much has been said about CIA. I also condemn CIA and their activities. But I condemn Russia also. Why is she interfering in our affairs? Their Embassy prepares the material and sends them to *New Age*, and through *New Age* that



anti-Indian material is spread in this country. Therefore, I say, I want to be friendly to Russia, I want to be friendly with America but, at the same time, I submit, do not be too much dependent on them. I do not agree with Shri Masani when he says that we should have their joint guarantee of nuclear umbrella. We cannot depend on America, we cannot depend on Russia. We must stand on our own legs and we must have our own atomic weapons to defend ourselves.

Then, we must pay more attention to the countries of Latin America, Africa and East Europe. They are getting out of the clutches of USA and USSR. They have got a lot of affinity and community of interest with us. We must pay more attention to our relationship with such countries.

Then, we must pay more attention to those countries like Mauritius, Trinidad, Sarinam and Giyana where people of Indian origin live in large numbers. They are peaceful countries. They are our firm friends in United Nations and outside. We must pay greater attention to their needs and interests.

Another object of our foreign policy must be to see to the interests of overseas Indians. Everywhere overseas Indians are being kicked away. Since freedom we have failed to protect their rights. We must do something for them. What is happening in Aden ? What has happened in Kenya ? Are they not matters of shame for us ? We must change our policy and we must see that interests of overseas Indians are also protected.

When we are discussing foreign policy, we must also see to it that policy is properly interpreted and properly implemented. That work is done by the Foreign Office. Our Foreign Office is literally a Foreign Office. It has an



American lobby, it has a Russian lobby, it has a Chinese lobby, it has a Pakistani lobby and it has an Arab lobby; but I wonder whether it has any Indian lobby. Make it an Indian Foreign Office. In this Foreign Office, there are people—I would be failing in my duty if I do not refer to it—like Mr Azim Hussain; about whom people have serious misgivings. He has emotionally more links with Pakistan and Arab countries. Make your Foreign Office really Indian Foreign Office and let it safeguard Indian interests.

In our Foreign Office we must try to have such officers as are attuned to our needs and our way of life. If India needs to nationalise anything, it is the Indian Foreign Office that has to be nationalised. We are having officers in our Foreign Office, we are having diplomats, who look more English than Indian. We need diplomats who feel, live and behave like Indians. I particularly stress that we should use more of Hindi in our Foreign Office. I have seen it, and many Ambassadors have told me, that because English is used we cannot keep our secrets because even our chauffeurs and sweepers get them. So, in our Foreign Office we should see that Hindi is used more and more so that our secrets and our national honour are maintained.

In the end I would say that we should give more opportunities to the young IFS officers. The ICS monopoly of the Foreign Office should go. We know that there are some good ICS officers. Let us send them for administrative jobs in Kashmir and Nagaland. Then, in our important foreign missions, particularly in countries like U.S.A. and USSR, we should have more public men. Dr. Radhakrishnan as our Ambassador in Russia did more for our country than any

career diplomat could do. Therefore, more attention should be paid to the appointment of right type of personnel in the diplomatic missions in crucial countries like the U.S.A., U.S.S.R. and Japan. We must take special care in the selection of our cultural attaches. Indian culture is essentially Hindu-Buddhistic culture and our cultural attaches must have a good grounding in that culture.

In conclusion, I would say that foreign policy is not a party question. All over the world foreign policy is looked upon as a bi-partisan thing. It is a national question. In foreign policy and matters relating to foreign countries we should appear to be one. But, unfortunately, for some time past, that is not the case because the Government has become oblivious, government has become disdainful to the public opinion. This must go. I would suggest that inside the House as also outside the House, consensus should be created in regard to all matters of foreign policy whether it is Pakistan, China or West Asia, so that whatever our differences in the country may be, to the outside world we may appear as one. Initiative in this regard must come from the ruling party and not from the Opposition. If they take the initiative and if they keep the national interest above all—ideology must not come in, party interest must not come in and only national interests must be uppermost—we can have a really national policy, a bipartisan foreign policy regarding all problems concerning our neighbours and other countries also.



# Rape of Czechoslovakia

[Speech delivered on 22.8.1968 during the debate on Prime Minister's statement in context to the entry of armed forces of the U.S.S.R. and other powers of Warsaw Pact]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I commend to this honourable House the substitute motion that has been moved to the motion of Shri R.D. Bhandare by my Party which reads :

**"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 21st August, 1968, in regard to the entry of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and some other Powers of Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia, strongly condemns the armed entry of the troops of the Soviet Russia and its Warsaw Pact Allies into Czechoslovakia as a wanton act of aggression against a peaceful neighbour and calls upon all peace-loving nations of the world to lend full support to the Czechoslovakian People and their leader Dubchek in their movement to assert their National Independence and right to determine their way of life freely."**

I wish we had no need to move this substitute motion. There would have been no need for it if the Prime Minister had come out with a statement which would have been worthy of her, worthy of this House and worthy of our great country. She, no doubt, expressed her anguish, the anguish of this country, over what has happened in



Czechoslovakia, but she failed to condemn what the Russians have done there and what other members of the Warsaw Pact have done there. I wonder why she faltered in her duty. After all, she is the daughter of the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Whatever other shortcomings there might have been in the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, we all bow to him for his advocacy of freedom ; whenever there was aggression anywhere, he always came forward in condemnation of it in the strongest possible terms. That we were expecting from the Prime Minister. The world expected India, the biggest and the largest democracy in the world, to come out in strongest terms in condemnation of what has been done in Czechoslovakia.

What is the crime that the Czechoslovakian people have done ? They are living in a communist country. They claim to be communist ; they continue to be socialist. Their only crime was that they wanted to have some liberalisation then the communist system. Their only crime was that they wanted to have some democracy in their country. At the same time they wanted to maintain their links with the Soviet Union and with the other Warsaw Pact countries. For that crime of having some liberal constitution, of having some freedom, they are being destroyed. They are being destroyed, they are being attacked, in the name of suppressing a counter-revolution.

Our communist friends say that there is a counter-revolution, there is a threat to socialism ; so Russia has the right to come in. May I ask them ; "Where is your slogan of 'Workers of the world, unite?' Is this the way of uniting the workers of the world ? Are the people of Czechoslovakia not human beings ? Are they not workers ?

Have they no right to shape their destiny as they want?"

So what Russia has done now has clearly proved that there is no difference between communism and nazism. Actually both are the same. Both look upon Hegel as their god-father. For both, the state is everything. Both want one state, one party, one leader. Both want to use their power to destroy every vestige of freedom wherever it exists. Therefore, it was the duty of every freedom-loving Indian, every freedom-loving human being, to condemn what has happened there.

Actually, what is the position? The legal Government of Czechoslovakia have issued a Proclamation which is worth reading. They issued this proclamation only yesterday. Therein they say :

**"We consider it (Russian invasion) a violation of international law and the provisions of the Warsaw Pact and the principles of equal relations among nations".**

The Warsaw Pact, by which the Russians swear, to which the other invaders of Czechoslovakia also adhere, says in Clause 8 :

**"The contracting parties declare that they will act in the spirit of friendship and co-operation with the aim of further developing and strengthening the economic and cultural relations between them, following the principles of mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty and non-interference in domestic affairs".**

This is the Warsaw Pact and it is the countries which are signatories to it which are invading Czechoslovakia now.

It has been said that the Russian armies have marched into Czechoslovakia on the invitation of the



Czechoslovak Government. I want to know who are the people, who are the leaders who have invited the Russian armies, the Polish armies and other armies to enter Czechoslovakia. Who are the quislings? We know the long history of quislings. The Russians have been depending upon them. There may be some quislings here also. Therefore, we should be careful about them. There may be some in the ruling party also. Of course, on this side we have a number of them.

I want to put some specific questions. I want to know who are the quislings, who are the people who have invited the Russians there? Have the Government of India any information? Have they made any enquiry from the Czech Embassy here, and have they sympathised with them? My information is that our Government have even refused to properly deal with the Czech Embassy here.

*Shri B.R. Bhagat* : You are wrong.

*Shri Balraj Madhok* : I wish I was wrong. I am prepared to be corrected. But I understand that only a very junior officer of the Government of India went there to talk with them. I think it was the duty of the Government of India to immediately contact the Czech Embassy here and sympathise with them and tell them that the 'Government and people of India sympathise with you in your travail; we are with you and express our solidarity with you'. But nothing of the sort has been done. Not only that efforts are being made to minimise the whole thing.....

*Shri Nath Pai* : As usual.

*Shri Balraj Madhok* : Of course, I have nothing to say about the communists. But I want to ask : is it a fact



that only the day before, the editor of the Indian 'Pravda' has gone to Moscow ? Is it a fact that the editor of *Patriot* has gone there to get instructions from the mentors there ? Is it a fact that our Government have released the foreign exchange for this trip of his to get instructions ?

*An Hon Member : Who ?*

*Shri Balraj Madhok : Shri Narayanan, editor of Patriot.*

I would specifically like the Government to make its position clear in this matter. So far as the people of India are concerned, we want to make it clear that this is not a thing which concerns only them. It is a question of morality, it is a question of humanity; above all, it is a question of national rights. We who stand for some kind of international morality, we who stand for some kind of principles governing relations between different nations, have a right today to ask the Russians, who even today swear by the Charter of the UN, whether the independence and freedom of Czechoslovakia can be trampled underfoot by its powerful neighbours. Today it is Czechoslovakia ; tomorrow it may be Rumania's turn.

It can be our turn also. Let us not forget that because such countries are surrounding us also and such dangers are developing around our country also. We have also quislings in our country who are prepared to play the game of the so-called peoples' democracies of Russia and China. Our own interests demand that such things are not perpetrated anywhere. Therefore, I want to make some specific suggestions which I think this Government will seriously consider and work upon.

## RAPE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Firstly, we should make it clear that we do not want to give recognition to any Czech Government that might be set up by the Russians in Czechoslovakia. The lawful government of that country is not yet gone. They have issued a proclamation through which they have appealed to their people to be peaceful and non-violent, and they have also made known their demands. The proclamation says :

**"We categorically demand the immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of the five Warsaw Pact States and full respect for the State sovereignty of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in accordance with the provisions of the Warsaw Pact. We urgently request the military commands of the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic and the Bulgarian People's Republic to issue orders to stop military actions causing bloodshed and damage to the economy of our country. We demand that normal conditions be immediately restored to enable the constitutional organs of the Republic to discharge their constitutional functions. We demand the release of all members of these organs so that they can resume their normal work."**

These are the demands put forth by the lawful Government of Czechoslovakia.

When that country was invaded, they sent a delegation to the Soviet Embassy in Prague led by the Speaker of the Parliament to argue with them and stop this kind of thing. But that delegation has been detained ; it has not come back. The President, the Prime Minister



and the other leaders have all been detained. We should join Czechoslovakia in demanding that the delegation should be released; that all the leaders of the Government including the President, the Prime Minister and Mr. Dubchek be freed so that they could function in freedom. If they do not do so, we should not recognise any Government that might be set up by the Russians in Czechoslovakia. Even if the lawful Government were to function from outside Czechoslovakia—it is quite possible that they might be hounded out of that country—we should recognise them and not recognise the puppet Government set up by the Russians.

The General Assembly of the United Nations is going to meet very soon and India must take the initiative in raising the question of Czechoslovakia, the question of preservation of peace and freedom and democracy there. We should not wait for others; we should take the initiative. We can join other countries also to deal with this matter in an honourable way.

Thirdly, we have been concerning ourselves with all kinds of affairs, wherever they arise, even where we are not directly involved. But here is a matter in which we are directly involved. We have the closest relations with the East European countries and we have a long history of friendship with Czechoslovakia. Those countries have been helping us in so many ways. Peace and war have become indivisible in this shrinking world. If peace is disturbed and war is forced in Europe, nobody can be sure that it will remain confined to Europe alone and will not engulf the whole world. Therefore, we have a direct interest in seeing that peace is maintained and the world is not engulfed in war by the aggressive actions of Russia and Poland. Therefore, we should take the



## RAPE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

diplomatic initiative and we should move the like-minded nations and non-aligned countries. Marshal Tito is there ; he has been taking some initiative in so many matters. Only recently, he visited Prague and some of the Ministers of the lawful Government of Prague are in Yugoslavia at the moment. We should take the initiative and call all these people to an international conference of all the countries who stand for freedom and democracy. We should mobilise world public opinion so that this aggression can be vacated.

Before concluding, I want to make one point very clear. We do not look upon this as a party question ; it is a national question. We are expressing the national will. There may be some quislings here or some Russian and Chinese patriots who may not agree with what I say. But they are Russian and Chinese patriots and we need not bother about them.

But so far as Indians are concerned, all the nationalists and all the democrats are of one mind.

If Government, therefore, accept the amendment moved by two senior Members of the Congress Party, namely Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani and Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah, then I shall be prepared to withdraw my substitute motion so that the whole House may express its opinion in an unanimous way and in a dignified way in favour of that amendment.

# India and the Commonwealth

[Speech delivered on 22.3.1968 on the question of withdrawal from the Commonwealth]

The resolution before the House has two parts. So far as Rhodesia is concerned, there can be no two opinions about what is happening there. It deserves our strongest condemnation. But what is happening in Rhodesia is also happening in Angola, South Africa and Tibet. Rhodesia, therefore, cannot be singled out. There are still imperialist powers in the world, both of the Western model as also of Eastern Communist model, which are suppressing local populations to maintain their imperialist hold on them. The sympathies of India lie with all such peoples whether in Rhodesia or Angola or South Africa or Tibet, as are struggling for their freedom.

But will mere expression of sympathy be of any help to the suffering peoples of these countries ? My answer is in the negative. Might has always been right in the world. Even the U.N.O. cannot help the weak. If we have the strength we can get things accepted. Why go far. We have the case of Shri Mohan Ranade before us. He heroically fought the battle for freedom of Goa and for that he has been languishing in Portuguese jails. It pains me to find that those who are so vociferous in their denunciation of what is happening in Rhodesia do not say a word about Mohan Ranade. It does not mean that we should not

speak out for the African people. But we must raise our voice of protest about Mohan Ranade as well. Charity begins at home. We have to make a distinction between Africa and our own Mohan Ranade.

Even in those countries of Africa which have attained freedom real power continues to remain in the hands of the British or the French. Shri Bali Ram Bhagat, our Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, who recently visited Kenya saw for himself how the British continue to enjoy a privileged position there while Asians, most of whom are Indians, are being squeezed out.

Therefore, let us go to the root of the problem. The basic fact is that India has lost its prestige in the world. Even though we might have increased our military strength over the last few years, still our position is like that of a man who may have money with him but because he has been declared bankrupt nobody trusts him, nobody lends him any money. On the other hand, there may be a man who really has nothing but because of his prestige he can command respect and have any amount of credit for the asking. Today our country is comparable to the man who has gone bankrupt. We have lost prestige. Our words whether uttered here or outside do not carry much weight.

The only real remedy is strength. India must become strong. Only then her voice will be heard in the U.N.O. and elsewhere.

To that end we must give serious thought to the second part of this resolution. We will have to decide whether to quit the Commonwealth or not.

I happened to be very young when freedom struggle was on. I was a primary school student when the session of the Indian National Congress was held at



Lahore. But I well remember that a debate was then going on in the country as to whether India should accept Dominion Status or stand for "Poorna Swarajya" i.e., complete freedom. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru at that time was the protagonist of "Poorna Swarajya". He was opposed to having any truck with the British after the attainment of freedom. Gandhiji held different views on the matter and many others in the Congress agreed with him.

Those who are well-versed in the history of those days know that had we agreed to Dominion Status, which meant freedom with membership of the Commonwealth, we might have got freedom long before 1947 without losing the unity of the country. But at that time we stuck to "Poorna Swarajya" and declared that we will have nothing to do with the British Commonwealth.

But when we got freedom with partition of the Motherland, we forgot "Poorna Swarajya" and decided to become a member of the Commonwealth.

I want to know what justification was there to opt for the Commonwealth after the British had delivered us the mortal blow of vivisection of the Motherland. Are other countries which refused to have anything to do with Commonwealth not exerting? Has Burma ceased to exist for not having maintained its links with the British by remaining in the Commonwealth?

Unfortunately our mental slavery has persisted even after the British left us. The people who got control over the Indian administration after freedom were those about whom Gandhiji used to say that they want the English to go but Englishism to continue while I want Englishism to go even though the English may continue. They were the mental slaves of the British. They were

the products of Lord Macaulay. Therefore, they decided to keep India within the Commonwealth even after the attainment of Freedom. Then they argued that the character of Commonwealth has changed. Its shape and form has been altered. All its members are now equals. If all are equal then why, I ask, the Commonwealth conferences are always held in London and British Prime Minister always presides over them ?

It was also argued at that time that India will be benefited by remaining in the Commonwealth. One such benefit was to be freedom of movement within Commonwealth countries without visa and secondly there would be preferential treatment in trade.

All these benefits are now gone. There can be no doubt about that after the developments in Rhodesia and treatment of Kenya-Indians with British Passports. The trade benefits will also go with the entry of the U.K. in the European Common Market. The real or supposed benefits of the Commonwealth, therefore, are no more. On the other hand, the disadvantages of remaining in Commonwealth are glaring.

The worst disadvantage of remaining in Commonwealth is that many countries of the world still look at India with British eyes and the same is true of us as well. We are now a free country with a will and individuality. Membership of Commonwealth has stood in the way of our developing an Indian personality of our own. The U.S.A. adopted the same policy regarding Kashmir as the British. In other matters too the U.S.A. and many other countries are guided by the British in their policy towards us. They presumably think that the British are the best guide regarding questions pertaining to India.



Had we not been a member of the Commonwealth, we might not have fallen into the trap laid for us regarding Kutch. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had gone to London to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference where the British Prime Minister, Mr. Wilson persuaded him to sign the Agreement about referring the Kutch issue to an International Tribunal from the evil effects of which we are now suffering.

Furthermore, our continuation in Commonwealth has helped in perpetuating the strongest hold of English language on our country. I am personally not opposed to English language. It is a rich language. But the status that has been given to this language in our national life because of our links with Britain goes against our national self-respect as also our national interests. It has become a bar in the way of our true freedom. Break with Commonwealth may help us in freeing ourselves of this stranglehold of English language.

What is worse, with our continuation as a member of the Commonwealth, our foreign office has continued to be a foreign office in the literal sense as well. A number of friendly diplomats of other countries told me during my last trip abroad that they had respect and sympathy for India but their regret was that Indian diplomats appeared to be more British than Indian.

Therefore whatever benefits membership of Commonwealth gave us—benefits about visa and trade, about common citizenship—have more or less disappeared while all the handicaps and disadvantages continue. Therefore time has come when we should seriously rethink about our membership of the Commonwealth. Pride and self-respect as a nation our self-interest as also the role that we aspire to play in the world demand that we get out of the Commonwealth.



# India and Germany

**[Speech delivered during debate on resolution for recognition of GDR]**

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the passionate plea that Professor Hiren Mukerjee has made for the recognition of German Democratic Republic, but I fail to appreciate the strong language that he has used against President Leubke and Chancellor Keisinger of West Germany. After all, we have friendly relations with West Germany. If somebody attacked in the same way even President Ayub, who is the head of our enemy country, Professor Mukerjee would have protested. He is a very senior and sober member of the House and, therefore, I did not expect that kind of language from him for the leaders of a country which is friendly and who recently visited us.

The question is that we should recognise the GDR. German Democratic Republic is a fact of history ; it is a fact of life. It is a reality. It does exist. How it came into existence, that is past history—I need not go into that. But it is a fact of life and we must accept it. Therefore I do not see any reason why any country, whether it is West Germany or anybody else, should pressurise us that we should not recognise the GDR. We should recognise it so long as it exists.

Today Germany stands divided. Today Korea stands divided. Today Vietnam stands divided. Today India stands divided. I do hope that a time will come

when Germany will become one, when Korea will become one, when Vietnam will become one and when India will become one. But so long as they remain divided, let us recognise the fact. I do not see any reason why we should not.

But then the question is of the policy you want to pursue. Shri Hiren Mukerjee talked of an independent foreign policy. I fully endorse it. I stand for it. But I do not understand his obsession with non-alignment. What is this non-alignment?

*An Hon. Member* : It is independent.

*Shri Balraj Madhok* : It is not independent. Every country has to be aligned and non-aligned at the same time. In life, as it is, every individual has certain friends, certain enemies and then there are others about whom he is not bothered. Similarly, every country has to be friendly with some and inimical with some, whether they like it or do not like it, and it has to be indifferent or neutral about others.

Take, for example, the classic example of the United Arab Republic. UAR, you say, is a non-aligned country. But UAR has military pacts with Iraq and Syria and still it says that it is non-aligned. Of course, I do want that India should be non-aligned as between the U.S.A. and the USSR, but I cannot understand how India can be non-aligned in our dispute with Pakistan. How can we be non-aligned when we are fighting with China and Pakistan? China and Pakistan are allies. As against China and Pakistan we have to have allies; we have to be aligned. But where our interests do not directly come in, we must try to be non-aligned.

Non-alignment is not a *Veda Vakya*; it is not a  
CC-0. Nanaji Deshmukh Library, BJP, Jammu. Digitized by eGangotri



principle, it is a policy. Just now Honourable Shri Ganesh was saying that we should not talk of the past, that we should not live in the past. Then why should we go on harping on Pandit Nehru ? Whether Pandit Nehru was good or bad, I do not want to say anything about him. But he has gone and the situation in which he propounded certain policies has also changed.

Therefore, today the time has come when we must rethink. We are a dynamic people ; we are not a static people. We have to develop and change policies according to the needs of the country and according to the needs of the situation. Therefore let us not harp on what Pandit Nehru said or did not say. We have to formulate a policy which suits the country today.

Today I feel that there is no reason why we should not recognise the GDR. But it has been said that we should do so because West Germany has done this or that, because West Germany has published a map in which Kashmir has been shown as an independent country. May I ask : If you can have full diplomatic relations with Pakistan which wants to grab Kashmir and which is using arms from Germany, America or China to beat us, why not have diplomatic relations with those countries which at least are not fighting with us ? We have diplomatic relations even with communist China which has been attacking and maligning us every day.

*Shri Amrit Nahata* : Nobody said that diplomatic relations with West Germany should be broken off.

*Shri Balraj Madhok* : That is no argument then. You argue why should we have relations with GDR. Why argue whether West Germany has done this or that? We should not bother about the political system that



a country has. The people have a right to have their own political system. So far as political systems in the Germanys are concerned, I have not been to East Germany but I had an opportunity to go to East Berlin for a day and I could see the difference between the socialist system and the free system. It was just like going from a marriage ceremony into a condolence meeting. There is a contrast. West and East Berlin present the best examples of what a free system of economy and a regimented economy can do to a people. Therefore, don't go into whether it is regimented system or not. I want that we should have full diplomatic relations with GDR because it is a fact of history and it is a fact of life. It is a separate country and so long as it exists, we must recognise it.

Once you accept this principle I ask : How can you deny full diplomatic recognition to Israel or to Taiwan ? Israel is as much a fact of life as East Germany. Now, about Israel, we say, that UAR. or the Arab countries will get angry. If we are opposed to West Germany dictating to us not to have relations with East Germany, if we are opposed to Hallstein doctrine, we have to be equally hostile, equally critical to Arab dictation and we must condemn this pressure tactics of UAR.

So far as the question of diplomatic relations is concerned, it has been argued that a number of countries have diplomatic relations with both East Germany and West Germany. There are 5 or 10 such countries no doubt. But there are more than ninety countries which have full diplomatic relations with both Israel and UAR. If so many countries can have full relation with both, why can't we have full diplomatic relations with both

those countries? You cannot have double standards. You must have the same standard for all countries. We should see whether our interests demand it or not. Even if our interests do not demand it and if the country is there, we must recognise it. We should not take any country as untouchable except when basic moral issues are involved as in the case of South Africa and Rhodesia.

So far as Israel is concerned, our interests do very much demand it. It is an important country. It is the most advanced country in West Asia. It has developed in so many ways. It has the technical know-how.

Its progress will be very much helpful to us. In West Asia, pan-Islamic bigotry and fanaticism, is taking the better of people's sanity. Anything can happen there. They are playing the game of Pakistan. We should therefore have dependable friends and, I think in West Asia, the only dependable friend that India can have for many years to come is Israel. Therefore, I suggest that we have full diplomatic relations with GDR; so also with Israel and so also with Taiwan.

Taiwan also is a big country with 13 million population. It occupies a very strategic position, and can provide a better window on Communist China than any other place. Therefore, even if you want to have information about Communist China, even then diplomatic relations with Taiwan will help us. From there, we can get the most reliable information.

So, my submission is that in international relations, in the matter of foreign policy, let us give up obsession with ideologies. Let us not be whimsical; let us get rid of whims and fancies of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru which guided his foreign policy. Let us have a foreign policy

which is rational and, at the same time, national. It should be both rational and national. It should care for the country's interests. In international relations, let us not allow our ideological obsessions or ideological predilections to take the better of us. Let us act as patriots.



# Betrayal on Kutch-1

[Speech delivered on the occasion of moving  
the motion of no-confidence on 27.2.1968]

I beg to move :

**“That this House expresses its want of confidence  
in the Council of Ministers.”**

I am moving this motion of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers for their failure to discharge the most elementary duty, to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country. According to all political scientists all through the history this has been considered the first duty of any government worth the name, and this government has been failing in discharging this duty all through.

Twenty years back the leaders of the party which rules the country today, let down this country when they accepted partition in spite of their opposition to two-nation theory on which the theocratic State of Pakistan was sought to be created, and a large part of the country was given away to constitute Pakistan. Then, what remained, that atleast should have been protected. But, even that has not been protected. Soon after the achievement of freedom and partition, Pakistan attacked Kashmir. It was an unprovoked aggression and we could have thrown Pakistan out. But, instead of doing that, we rushed to UNO, then we had a cease-fire and the result was that Pakistan got 35,000 sq. miles of our territory. Pakistan is sitting tight over that territory

since then. That was the fruit of aggression that she got at that time, and that set the pattern of Indo-Pak relations. Ever since, Pakistan has been following an aggressive policy towards India. They make fantastic claims, they occupy our territory and we sit tight in the name of peace, in the name of international agreements and all that. This has been the pattern. If you look at the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, Nehru-Noon Pact, Indus Water Agreement or the Swaran Singh-Sheikh Agreement, the same pattern is followed and Pakistan stands to gain by it.

The rulers and leaders of Pakistan have come to realise that an aggressive policy against India pays a rich dividend. They have a vested interest in keeping up tension with India because they realise that if they learn to co-exist with India in peace the very *raison-d'être* for existence of Pakistan as a separate State will disappear. So, whatever the excuse be, they will keep up the tension so long as we go on surrendering before them. The present case of Kutch is the latest of that series of surrenders before the enemies of the country at the cost of Indian territorial integrity.

Now, what is this Kutch question ? When India was partitioned, Pakistan was given Sind, Baluchistan, North-West Frontier Province, a part of Punjab and a part of Bengal. The boundary of Sind was defined. Only the boundary of Pakistan in Punjab and in Bengal was laid down by Radcliffe Award. Therefore, if anything was to be settled in regard to boundaries between India and Pakistan, it was in regard to that half of Punjab and half of Bengal, and there too Radcliffe had laid down the principles. He had drawn the maps and then he had given description on paper and he had laid down in his



award itself that where there is discrepancy between the map and the description given on the paper, the description on the paper should be taken as the final word.

Therefore, whatever territorial or boundary disputes we had with Pakistan, they pertained only to Bengal and the Punjab.

So far as the boundary of Sind and Kutch is concerned, there was no question of a dispute. It had been settled for centuries past and anyone who goes to Kutch and sees the whole area can see it for himself. I was there only yesterday. The Rann does not lie between Kutch and Sind ; it lies entirely in Kutch. There is a *banni* or bank on this side of the Rann and a *banni* or bank on the other side of the Rann. That is called Dhara Banni. Beyond that, there is a long range of sandy hills, which forms the natural boundary. That has been true all through the centuries.

The British got control over Kutch in 1819 and they got control over Sind in 1843. At that time they had to demarcate the boundary because now it was under their control. For that purpose they appointed a survey team headed by one Mr. MacDonald. He surveyed the whole border and on that basis maps were prepared. The first map was printed in 1870. Those maps are repeated again and again. In those maps the boundary between Kutch and Sind has been very clearly delineated.

The administration of Sind raised certain doubts about a part of that boundary and there was some discussion between the Kutch Durbar and the Sind Administration. After that the Bombay Government, which at that time controlled both Sind and the rest of Bombay, passed a Resolution in 1914 in which that dispute was resolved. The Sind Government at that time did

not raise any doubt about the rest of the boundary. The dispute that it had raised was only for a small part of it. That was settled then and after that there was no such dispute.

The area of Sind has been clearly laid down in the Gazeteers of Bombay and Sind. If you read the gazeteer of 1907 or 1909, the area of Sind has been given as 41,836 square miles. That has been the area of Sind all through and that was the area in 1947. That has been the area of Sind which has been given out by Pakistan's own publications even after partition.

There is one district of Sind, known as Tharparkar, which is adjacent to Kutch. Before partition it had 80 per cent Hindu population. Sylhet District, which had only 51 per cent Muslim population, was taken away from Assam and given to Pakistan. On the same basis this District of Tharparkar should have been taken away from Sind and given to India. It was one of the greatest betrayals of the people of Sind by the leaders of the Congress, both in Sind and at the Centre, that they never demanded Tharparkar; otherwise, Tharparkar should have come to India on the same basis on which Sylhet had gone to East Bengal.

This Tharparkar is bulging into the Kutch territory, particularly the Nagarparkar Taluka of Tharparkar is a sort of an enclave in the Kutch territory. Even about that, there was no dispute. For some time the British Government treated Tharparkar, particularly Nagarparkar, as part of Kutch. It was the Political Agent of Kutch who controlled Nagarparkar. That only showed that Nagarparkar belonged to Kutch and not to Sind. But later on, in their own wisdom, they thought it fit to transfer Nagarparkar to Sind.



This was the position and there was no dispute about it. Pakistan also never raised a dispute. It is true that Dhara Banni on the other bank of the Rann, which is adjacent to Sind, is a great grassland and Sindhi cattle used to come and graze over there. For that purpose the Kutch Durbar used to charge grazing tax or, what they call, *Panchari*, from them. The Kutch Durbar had put up a chowki at Chhad Bet to collect this tax. I saw in Kutch the contracts and the contractors who were appointed by the Kutch Government to collect that tax for it.

Therefore from every point of view it was Indian territory. The boundary was settled. If there was any boundary dispute, it was only with regard to the Radcliffe Line which never touched Sind and Kutch. After 1947, when some geological surveys were made of this area it was found that it contains oil. Then Pakistan began to cast her greedy eyes on it. Pakistan had seen how to deal with leaders of India—not of India, of the Congress Party, I should say—the cowards as they are. They said that half the Rann of Kutch belonged to them. It does not cost anything to put up a fantastic claim. You can say that this building or this house belongs to you. So, they put up the claim that the Rann belonged to them. We should have rejected it outright at that time. There was no question of any dispute. But then our benign Government and its benign negotiator, Sardar Swaran Singh, who has been very much keen, I think, about handing over our territory to others—he was the man who accepted in the Swaran Singh-Sheikh Agreement that it was a disputed territory.

Of course, he did so under the instructions of Mr. Nehru. The Nehru Desh Bhushan Library, Bhopal, has been digitized by eGangotri.

tiations on his (Pt. Nehru's) behalf and he was the man who gave away Dera Baba Nanak bridge which belonged to us, to Pakistan to placate her. They forget that they cannot placate Pakistan. Even if you give Delhi to Pakistan, you cannot placate her. The very existence of Pakistan depends on keeping up tensions. Her rulers will find one excuse or the other to keep up tension with India.

In the first place, there was no dispute. We wrongly accepted that as a dispute in Swaran Singh-Sheikh Agreement. In that Agreement it was said that the officers of the two countries should meet and investigate. No investigation was ever made. Then, suddenly, on one fine morning, in January, 1965, Pakistan occupied a part of that territory, including Kanjarkot and some other areas. Then, we said, "You must quit." Our late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, said, "We will not give an inch of our territory."

I agree that this Government does not give territory in inches ; it gives territory in miles and hundreds of miles.

*Some Hon. Members :* Shame, Shame !

*Shri Balraj Madhok :* Instead of pushing them back, we entered into an Agreement and that Agreement was not made by us. That Agreement was made by the Whitehall, the British foreign office. It was drafted there and sealed there. The people of India, even the important dignitaries of the Government of India, came to know about it only afterwards. When this Agreement came here before the Cabinet, the Attorney-General was away, the Law Minister was not there and, we now learn that the other legal luminary of our government at that



time, Mr. Chagla, was also not there. The only legal man that was present was Shri Swaran Singh, who was already committed.

That Agreement went beyond the scope. It not only used the word, demarcation of boundary but also the word determination of boundary. It was a bad Agreement ; it was a wrong Agreement and we protested at that time. The country protested against that. Bhartiya Jana Sangh staged a huge demonstration of people of India against that Agreement at that time. We said, "You are playing with the country's integrity and sovereignty." But you accepted it and at that time you said, "Our case is foolproof ; our documents are strong ; the maps are on our side. There is no reason why the Award should go against us." But the Award has come now.

If the Agreement was bad, this Award is perverse. You can say that you had entered into an Agreement. That may be a fact of history. But the question is : What is the Award ? Some people now say, "How can you go against it ? We are bound hand and foot." That is wrong. In the case of arbitration awards, if they are perverse, if they transgress certain minimum conditions laid down, they need not be accepted. And those conditions are that the Tribunal should not go beyond its authority, that the Tribunal should not be bribed and that the Tribunal should not transgress the fundamental rules of procedure. I ask my Congress friends : If it is proved, I say, hypothetically, that the Judge who gave judgement in favour of Pakistan was bribed, will you still say, "We are bound by it ; we cannot go against it ?" Here is the question. If the Judge was bribed, if the Tribunal was bribed, then this has no binding on us.

Secondly, there is no doubt that the Tribunal

transgressed its authority. It was to determine the boundary. What has it done? It has not determined the boundary on the basis of maps and on the basis of documents. If you read the Award—I do not want to waste the time of the House by reading the Award—what does it say? It says that there was an intensive activity of Pakistan in that area. What was the intensive activity? It was uninhabited. So, the activity was that Pakistani cattle used to come and graze there. If you have a field and your neighbours' cattle come to graze in your field, then your field goes! Is this an argument? Is this logic? Apart from that, what do they say about the enclaves? If you look at the map, Nagarparkar is a Pakistani enclave in Indian territory. There is only a narrow neck which links Nagarparkar with Pakistan. Now, instead of handing over that enclave to India, the Award says that because there is only a narrow neck which links it with Pakistan, so Pakistan should have a larger inlet into its enclave and because two inlets of India make it dangerous for Pakistan, both these inlets, because they are surrounded on three sides by Pakistan, be given to Pakistan.

This, the Award says, will remove the causes of tension. May I know whether this Tribunal was appointed for demarcation of boundary or whether it was appointed for removing the causes of tension? That was not its job. It has clearly transgressed its authority; it has clearly gone beyond its terms of reference. Therefore, on that count too, this award is not binding on us.

Thirdly, this award is not unanimous. I think, if there is any judicial judgement, it is only that of Mr. Baber. Apart from the fact whether it is in favour



or against, if any one reads it, he will find that he has quoted documents. he has quoted maps. It looks to me that only that reads as a judicial judgement. The judgement of the Chairman and the Pakistan's representative on the Tribunal is a purely politically-motivated, politically-biased judgement ; in fact, it is not a judgement at all.

By giving this kind of judgement, I tell you, this Tribunal has done a great disservice to the international forums as such. India is one country which has had faith in international tribunals—even after we got our fingers burnt in the case of Kashmir. Pakistan attacked us and we were strong enough to drive the Pakistanis out of Kashmir ; we could have driven the Pakistanis out of Lahore also. But instead of doing that, we went to the UNO because we did not want war. But what happened ? Within a few months, we were in the dock. We had gone as accusers, but we became the accused, and late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself had to admit while speaking in Jammu on February 15, 1951, "We had gone for justice, but we feel very unhappy to find that the nations of the world sitting in that body got lost in power politics."

Even after having burnt our fingers, we referred this case to arbitration. We should not have referred this case to arbitration. In fact, whenever the sovereignty of the country is involved, whenever the territorial integrity of the country is involved, such a question cannot be referred to arbitration, and should not be referred to arbitration.

Now, by behaving the way this Tribunal has behaved, it has made a mockery of tribunals and shaken the faith not only of the people of India but of the whole

world in the efficacy or judiciousness of such tribunals. Therefore, I say that on the ground that it has transgressed its authority, on the ground that it is not unanimous, on the ground that it is politically-motivated, we must repudiate this Award. It is not binding on us. We should tell the world that we had accepted a bad agreement in good faith, but we are not prepared for a perverse judgement. We wanted a judicial judgement. This is not a judicial judgement.

This Government has failed not only in referring the matter to the Tribunal but also in putting our case before it properly. I ask : did you bring the Tribunal to the site ? It was your duty to ask the Tribunal to come to the site. I wonder whether Shri Swaran Singh has gone there or whether Shrimati Indira Gandhi has gone there. Let them go and see for themselves where the boundary lies. There is a natural boundary. The hills make a natural boundary, and in the place of a natural boundary, this award has given an unnatural boundary, which cuts Kutch through our territory. Therefore, they failed in presenting the case properly, they failed in asking the Tribunal to come to the site and see the things for themselves before giving the award.

The question is : what should be done now ? I say, repudiate this award. It goes against the will of the people, the declared will of the people. I have seen how the people of Kutch, the people of Gujarat, the people of the whole country, are feeling about it. If you want to implement it, you cannot implement it without an amendment of the Constitution. It is not a delineation or just fixing of the boundary. It is a clear case of transfer of territory. You can read the award. They say that these enclaves should be given to Pakistan



because they will remove the causes of tension.

So, there is no question of rectification of boundary and there is no question of delineation of boundary, but it is a clear case of transfer of territory. According to the Indian Constitution, you cannot transfer any part of the Indian territory without an amendment of the Constitution and, therefore, no action can be taken unless the Constitution is amended. And I am pretty sure that this Parliament and this country will throw out any such amendment of the Constitution.

There is a further remark that I would like to make, namely, that some lessons have to be learnt out of this. The way things have been happening in this country for some time past clearly show that Pakistan is our enemy, that China is our enemy, and they are active on our frontiers, and their agents are active within the country. I can well understand why the Communists speak for the acceptance of this award, because they have something in their mind and they want a similar arbitration for the territory which has been occupied by China and they want a similar arbitration for territories occupied by Pakistan in Kashmir.

I want to warn the Government that this support of the Communists is a very dangerous thing and let them think twice before jumping for that kind of support.

We have to re-think and we must have a new look at the entire pattern of Indo-Pak relations. Pakistan is an enemy, and Pakistan will remain an enemy so long as it exists in the present form. This is a basic fact of history, and this is a basic fact of life, which the sooner our Congress leaders and Members realise, the better it would be for all concerned.

Therefore, I would submit that no kind of appease-

ment and no kind of surrender to Pakistan is going to win us friendship of Pakistan. Therefore, Government must change their present policy towards Pakistan. The only effective policy towards Pakistan is a policy of reciprocity, a policy of firmness. These kinds of piece-meal agreements, agreement over the Farrakka barrage, agreement on aviation, agreement on Kutch etc., are wrong. If the Government want to have an agreement with Pakistan, let them have a package agreement. Let all the disputes be put together. Pakistan is only getting those disputes settled in which she is interested ; the Indus Waters Treaty was made because it helped Pakistan. Other treaties were made which helped Pakistan only, because she was interested in them. But wherever our interests are concerned, they do not want to enter into an agreement with us. Therefore, we should not have any piece-meal agreement with Pakistan. We should only have a package deal with Pakistan. The whole pattern of Indo-Pak relations that we have established for the last so many years must be changed. If we do not change it, then what has happened in Kutch may repeat. This has set a dangerous precedent. If Pakistan wants some territory, first she will put forward a claim because it does not cost anything to put forward any claim, then, she will send her forces to occupy part of the area and then stay put there. When we try to push them out, she will call world opinion and say, let us have arbitration, and she will then take that area. This is a very dangerous precedent. I would submit that we should not follow it. We should not allow such precedents to be set at all.

Therefore, I say that this Kutch agreement is a warning. We should see that the whole pattern of Indo-



Pak relations that we have established for the last twenty years must change.

Secondly, we must see that proper leadership is given to the country. Today, the people all over the country are saying that this Government has a Prime Minister but no leader ; She is only a Prime Minister ; in fact, I wonder whether she is the Prime Minister even or not. But she is no leader. The result is that here we have a Government which is weak, a Government neither feared by our enemies nor respected by our friends, a Government neither feared by traitors nor respected by patriots. Such a government cannot run the country. Today we are faced with grave dangers, dangers of external aggression, dangers of internal disturbance and disruption ; and the external enemies and internal enemies are working in collusion. In such conditions, it is very important that the nationalist forces should assert themselves and see that the country has a strong leader. The whole history bears this out that whenever in India our Central Government became weak and came in weak hands, fissiparous tendencies raised their head in different parts of the country and our country was disintegrated.

I fear that a similar thing is happening in this country today. It is something which must make every one of us, every patriot, and every nationalist to stand up and think where we are going. We must have a strong Government. I would make this appeal to my Congress friends. I know that many of them are patriots, not all of them.

*An Hon. Member* : All of them are.

*Shri Balraj Madhok* : Many of them are patriots. Many of them are nationalists. But they are all dumb-

founded and they cannot speak out. I sometimes used to wonder why Bhishma was keeping silent when Duryodhana was doing all those mischievous deeds. But now I realise why Bhishma could not speak out. Here, we have the Government of Duryodhana, and a whole lot of Bhishmas are sitting opposite doing nothing. I would appeal to these Bhishmas that instead of repenting later, let them do something now.

It is not their question only. It is a question of the whole country. If the country goes to dogs, where will the Congress, the Jana Sangh and other nationalist parties be ? Today it is not a question of left and right but of the nationalist forces and anti-national forces. Anti-national forces are out to disrupt the country, they are out to destroy the country. They want to destroy the unity of the country and to bring about chaos and anarchy in the country, and to undermine the democratic values of the country.

In such a situation, it becomes very important that the nationalist elements should come together. They should sit together and work in unison. We may have our differences in economic matters, in social matters, but on one matter, we do not disagree. We are all one that this country must remain one, that this country must remain united, that this country must remain democratic. We must have democracy and we must remain united. On these two questions, there is no difference of opinion. As I said, there are people who are out to disrupt the country and destroy democracy here. I am very sorry to say that in this destruction of democracy, this Government is acting as an active agent, as a catalytic agent.

I do not mind Ministries coming in or going out.



But look at the way things are being done. What happened to UP ? The Governor says, 'the Constitution cannot be worked, but I want to give time'. For what ? "There may be a reorientation of political affiliations". I ask : can there be a more immoral thing than this ? Can there be a more unethical thing than this ? If the Constitution cannot be worked, dissolve the Assembly. They dissolved the Assembly in West Bengal, they dismissed the Ministry and dissolved the Assembly in Haryana. They should have dissolved the Assembly in UP also. The argument that we have to elect members for the Rajya Sabha does not click. We have to elect members from West Bengal also to the Rajya Sabha. If they are not elected now, they will be elected six months later. So this is not an argument that can be advanced for the decision taken in regard to UP. The real thing is that they want to give time to the Congress to have some defections from the other side, to have some horse-trading.

If the ruling party, which has a special responsibility in establishing and following democratic conventions behaves in this way, I ask, where will be respect left for the Constitution ? Where will be respect for the President who is the symbol of the whole country, who should not have been made a party to such matters ? But they are bringing the President into disrepute, they are bringing the Constitution into disrepute. They are undermining the very values of democracy, though they swear that they have come to power to uphold and sustain it.

Therefore, I say, on all counts this Government has failed to deliver the goods. It has failed to protect the sovereignty of the country ; it has failed to protect the

honour of the country.

Our Jawans are fighting on the frontiers. But within the country we find that the national flag is being burnt and trampled underfoot. I ask : what have you done to those people who have dishonoured our national flag ? Did you ever think what effect it will have on the morale of our soldiers who are guarding our frontiers ? They are fighting there, they are standing guard to defend the honour of the flag. But within the country, you cannot do it.

What are the laws for ? Have you not enough laws to deal with this situation ? We have been demanding time and again for the enactment of a law defining treason.

Anyone who dishonours our flag is a traitor, and treat him as a traitor and give him the maximum punishment. But what have you done about it ? These are matters on which there is no difference of opinion among all nationalist parties. We must all come together and do something to set things right.

But for this purpose, the Congressmen must realise that they alone cannot do it. Today the Congress is one of the parties, and not the party, in the country. To tackle these problems, it must work with the others. This Government must go and there should be national Government, a Government which can command the confidence of the people, which can have the respect of the patriots, which will be feared by the traitors. We want such a Government to meet the challenges we are facing.

Before I conclude, let me sum up and say that this Kutch award must be repudiated because the Tribunal has transgressed its authority, it has gone beyond its



terms of reference ; the award is not judicial but political, and it is not a unanimous award. On these grounds, it must be repudiated. If you want to do anything about it, you must come before Parliament. You must amend the Constitution. Without amending the Constitution, you cannot proceed.

Let me sound a note of warning : even if you think that you can get this thing through with the help of your majority or with the help of the Communists, the country is not with you.

The country will stand up against any such bargaining of national integrity, national honour and national sovereignty. In a democracy the people are the ultimate masters, and the ultimate masters demand that you repudiate the agreement.

## Betrayal on Kutch-2

[Speech delivered on 28.2.1968]

I have heard with great attention the utterances of the Hon. Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Home Minister and a number of Hon. Members from the Congress Benches who have spoken on this motion. The very fact that such senior-most members of the ruling party found it necessary to intervene shows that the arguments that we had put forth, that the case we had presented, has proved to be effective.

I am sorry to say that while replying to the debate, they have depended more on invectives, more on references, to the late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, for whom we have as much respect.....

*Shri Morarji Desai* : Please cite the invectives.

*Shri Balraj Madhok* : .....as the Congress Benches have because I look upon him as the first, really, truly, Indian Prime Minister of free India and, therefore, any reference to him is not going to create any kind of feeling in our minds against him or in favour of him. He was a great son of the country and we respect him.

The question is : What is the issue ? The Hon. Prime Minister just now said that we are bound by international commitments. The Deputy Prime Minister said: प्राण जायं पर वचन न जाई ! May I know what has happened to your *vachans* about Kashmir ? What has happened to your *vachans* about other parts of the country ? You have



forgotten them conveniently. You remember your *vachans* only when it serves your purpose and when it means surrender of the national territory. I wish even now you respect your *vachans*, what you have pledged to the country regarding Kashmir, your pledge to the country that you will not give up an inch of your territory.

We have already lost 50,000 sq. miles of Indian territory. There have been four invasions on our country in the last 20 years as a result of which we have already lost 50,000 sq. miles. Do you have the cheek now to say that you have been defending the country? Do you have the cheek to say that you have been defending the sovereignty of the country? You have been bartering away the integrity of the country; you have been bartering away the sovereignty of the country. This is a charge on you.

*Some Hon. Members :* Shame, shame !

*Shri Balraj Madhok :* You say that you don't agree with my thesis of Indo-Pak relations. I have the good fortune or misfortune of coming from that area which is now Pakistan. My home is lost; my lands are lost and I lost a good number of my kinsmen. I know what is Pakistan. I wish you had understood the character of those who rule Pakistan. I am not against all Pakistanis. I know the people of Sind, the people of Bengal and Pakhtoonistan are groaning under the heels of Ayub. They want liberation and, I think, we should help them in their liberation movements.

When I say Pakistan is going to remain our enemy, I mean the people who rule Pakistan today are going to remain our enemy because their interests demand that. I agree with Mr. Chavan that there can be no permanent

friends and permanent enemies and that there can be only permanent interests and it is the interests of the Pakistan rulers which impel them to remain our enemy.

*Shri Nath Pai* : That is Palmerston.

*Shri Balraj Madhok* : Yes; he quoted him, the devil quoting the scriptures.

Look at the last 20 years of Indo-Pak relations. After all, one must learn by experience. What has been your experience in the last 20 years? The more you try to appease them, the more you try to placate them, the more you try to befriend them, the more they kick you. What has happened to the Tashkent Agreement?

I am not a war-monger. I do not want to create scare in anybody's mind. Mr. Chavan said that there were three courses open; negotiation or war or arbitration. He said that we should not go to war lightheartedly. I know we should not go to war lightheartedly. I know the horrors of war. We have gone through them. A large number of my kith and kin are serving in the armed forces of the country. I myself would have been in the army. I got the commission in 1942. But the call of nation called me on this side and I am in politics. Otherwise, I would have been in the army. That has been the profession of our family all through the centuries. Therefore don't tell me about the horrors of war. I know the horrors of war. But the question is: Were you able to avoid war by entering into this Agreement? If it had avoided war, I would have agreed with you. But it only created an impression in the minds of Pakistanis that India cannot fight, that India is weak, that India has neither the will nor the capacity to fight and, therefore, it only encouraged Pakistan to wage a war on us.



I say, this policy of appeasement, this policy of weakness, is going to bring war nearer. Shakespeare has said : "Cowards die many a time before their death."

And we have the experience of Munich pact between Germany and England. Therefore, this is not the way of avoiding war. The only way to avoid war is : be strong, be powerful, stand on your own legs. By depending on Mr. Kosygin or Mr. Johnson or Mr. Wilson you are not going to defend yourselves. My question is : what have you done all these twenty years to make this country strong ? Had we been strong, there would have been no invasion from Pakistan; had we been strong, there would have been no invasion from China. But because you kept the country weak, there were these invasions.

We have everything to make us a strong power. We have the manpower, we have the industrial power, we have a rich fighting tradition but because we have a bad leadership, we have bad policies, all these things have gone to dogs and the country has remained weak. That is why I say that this is not the way of doing the things. This way you cannot defend the country.

You have failed to defend the country and that is one reason why I demand that you must go. Our Prime Minister is like good Queen Bess. I wish she had also the qualities of that queen. I do not doubt anybody's motives, I do not doubt anybody's patriotism, but the question is what policy you follow. Your policies are leading the country towards destruction. She is a lady and that is the privilege she has. I cannot forget that I am a Hindu ; I must show her respect, I must show her the respect that is due to Mathri Shakti. But she must also show respect to the interests of this country, to the

interests of the people of this country. And the greatest service that she can do to the country at the moment is that she should resign voluntarily. That is the only service that she can do because she cannot give the requisite leadership. What has happened during the last ten years of her stewardship? Fissiparous forces have raised their ugly heads all over the country and the country's image has gone down. Therefore, when I say that you have failed, I do not doubt your patriotism. Even a patriot can commit mistakes, and you have been committing mistakes, you have been following wrong policies. That is the main charge.

Even if this award is to be accepted, why should you go about making propaganda that it is very good. The moment this award came, instead of discussing it dispassionately, objectively, the All India Radio began preaching, broadcasting, that it is very good that we have saved 90%. I would request you to remember what Mr. Chagla said in this connection in the other House. We have saved 90%. Is this an argument? The whole of Rann belongs to us. My friend, Mr. Sheth, said that there was a dispute. He is wrong. There was no dispute. There was a dispute only about the western sector and that dispute too had been settled by the Resolution of the Bombay Government in 1914. Pakistan never challenged it in 1947. The area of Sind given by Pakistan in 1947, 1948 and 1954 is 48,136 sq. miles. There was no dispute. If you think it fit to plead the case of Pakistan, I can only pity you. That is not the way of doing things—look at the way you are pleading. Chhad Bet is gone, but Point 84 is with us. What a pity! How are we trying to mislead the country! What is Point 84? There is the vast Rann and there

CC-0. Nanaji Deshmukh Library, BJP, Jammu. Digitized by eGangotri



are certain tracts, certain areas in it, which are lifted, one or two feet above the Rann and there we have grass-land. The Army for the purpose of identification has given names to certain points on such Bets. This Point 84 is as good or as bad, as high or as low, as any other point or Bet in the whole of Rann : It may be just 6 inches higher or 6 inches lower. But our Government goes about saying that we have got the highest point with us. Can there be a greater attempt at misleading the country ? Is this the duty that you are doing to the country ? Why can't you tell the facts ? Here we have 'Satyameva Jayate' as our motto. Is this 'Satyameva Jayate' ? Is this the truth that you speak ? You talk of 'Satya' but you murder 'Satya' in this country and in this Parliament. This is my charge against you.

My submission is that even now things are not beyond control. We can still mend the things. My Hon. friend, Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi, was saying, what can we do, how can we challenge the award ? I can point out a number of cases in international law where the awards of arbitration have been challenged. There was a case in 1911 when there was a dispute about the Chamizal tract between Mexico and the United States. There, the award given by the arbitrator was that the tract should be cut into two parts.

The USA contended that the whole tract belonged to her, and Mexico contended that the whole tract belonged to her. But the arbitrator said, let it be cut into two halves, and let one half go to the USA and let the other half go to Mexico. But because the arbitrator had gone beyond his jurisdiction and gone beyond his terms of reference, this award was contested and repudiated.

Then, again, in 1931 there was a border dispute between Canada and the USA. There were two lines on the north-eastern border of Canada and the USA. one line claimed by Canada and the other line claimed by the USA as the boundary. The King of the Netherlands was called upon to arbitrate and give his award as to which line was correct. But instead of giving his award in favour of the one line or the other, he drew up a third line and said that that should be the line. This award was contested because he had only to decide which of those two lines was correct and he had no business to give a third line.

In the case of Kutch now what has happened ? Here was a boundary. We said that the boundary had been demarcated. The tribunal had only to see whether the boundary was demarcated or not. But what does the tribunal say ? The tribunal has said that no case has been proved, and since cattle from Pakistan or cattle from Sind had been grazing in Chaad Bet area, therefore, they would award Chaad Bet to Pakistan. Similarly because there are certain inlets and certain enclaves of India bulging into Pakistan on either side of Nagar-parkar, the tribunal has said that it would award those inlets to Pakistan.

Shri Morarji Desai has said that it is demarcation of boundary and it is not transfer of territory. Shri Morarji Desai is an old man. I respect old men. He has the privilege of old age and old age has also its privileges, and, therefore, he can have his way and he can snub anybody here. But may I ask him how he can say that it is not transfer of territory ? What business had the tribunal to say that those inlets should be given away to Pakistan ? If you read the award you would find



that the tribunal has quoted an old document from Pakistan which says that if these inlets remained in the hands of Kutch it could build its fortification there and that might endanger Sindh territory. On this ground that Kutch can build its fortification there and, therefore, endanger Sind territory and Pakistan territory, the tribunal has said that these inlets should be given away to Pakistan. May I know whether this is demarcation of boundary or this is outright transfer of territory? In fact it is not only transfer of territory outright, but it is outright robbery of Indian territory to appease Pakistan.

My submission, therefore, is that here is a clear case of transfer of territory; it is not demarcation of boundary at all. And they cannot transfer territory without amending the Constitution. The Constitution will have to be amended. Without amending the Constitution they cannot do it. On this point a reference will have to be made to the Supreme Court. Here is our Constitution and we are bound by it. Government cannot transfer the territory of the country without amending the Constitution.

I would like to make another constructive suggestion. If they do not want to repudiate the award, at least they can refer the case back to the tribunal pointing out the flaws and pointing out the discrepancies. Let the Government refer the case back to the tribunal. At least, Government could ask them for a review. But the Government say that because the award has been given, therefore, we are bound by it and so, we have to accept it, whether it be right or wrong. I submit that this is a wrong approach.

Government say that we are taking a partisan approach. My submission is that it is not we who

are taking a partisan approach but it is they who are taking a partisan approach. They never rise above their party. They never think of the country. That is our charge against them. The question of national defence and the question of national sovereignty are not party questions. The Kashmir question is not a party question. We have always looked upon these questions as national questions. We have always suggested, let us sit round a table and evolve a national policy, but Government never do it.

My appeal to Government is this : So long as they had almost a monopoly of power, that might have been all right. But now they are just one of the parties, and the country is facing great dangers, internal and external, and, therefore, in the name of the country and in the name of Bharat Mata, I appeal to them that for God's sake, sometime at least let them rise above the party considerations and think of the country. I know that they have their loyalty to the Congress. I have also my loyalties to the Jana Sangh. But then it is only if the country lives and if the country remains strong and united that the Jana Sangh will grow and the Congress will grow. If the country does not remain, then where will the Jana Sangh be and where will the Congress be ? Therefore, the country is above the Congress and the country is above the Jana Sangh and the country is above the PSP and the Swatantra parties.

Let us think of the country first. If we think of the country first, then many of these problems can be tackled, can be solved, and public opinion in the entire country can be mobilised. We can have the public opinion of the country with us. Then we can meet the



greatest enemy. We can meet China and we can meet Pakistan. But with a divided country, with a people who have lost faith in the rulers, who have lost faith in this Government and in the leadership and with a crisis of confidence in the country, we cannot do that. What is important is to have a strong government. It is there that the present Government is failing. Therefore, I commend my motion for the acceptance of the House. I do hope that even the patriotic Congressmen will support me in throwing this Government out.

Before I conclude, I would like to pay my tribute to Judge Bebler of Yugoslavia. I do not do so in any partisan sense. Read the Judgment. Any independent man, when he reads the judgment, feels that here is a judgment of a Judge, here is a Judge with a judicial mind. He has not allowed political considerations to come in. He has quoted documents, he has quoted maps and then given his judgment. Therefore, before I request the House to accept my motion and throw this Council of Ministers out, I would like to pay a tribute to Judge Bebler of Yugoslavia.

# India's Industrial Policy

[Speech delivered in Lok Sabha on 7.8.1968 during debate on Dr. Hazari's Report.]

I have read the Report of Dr. Hazari with the care it deserves and I have also listened with patience to the fire-works that the Hon. lady Member caused in this honourable House. One thing which becomes clear immediately once you go through the Report is that Dr. Hazari allowed the political and ideological considerations to take the better of him as an academician.

If he had not gone beyond the terms of reference, it would have been alright. The terms of reference were very clearly given by him in his own Report. They were :

**“(i) To review the operation of licensing under the Industries Act broadly over the last two Plan periods and more closely over the last six-seven years, including the orderly phasing of licensing with reference to targets of capacity.**

**“(ii) To consider and suggest in the light of the present stage of economic development where and in what direction modifications may be made in the licensing policy.”**

This was the task entrusted to him and this was, in itself, quite a big task, and if he had applied his mind to it—he did apply his mind to some extent and some of the suggestions that he has made are really thought-provoking and they should be looked into—it would



have been alright. But he has brought in so many extraneous things in his Report which has made it a subject of controversy not in the country but in the Congress Party itself because the Congress Party, as everybody knows, is as much divided into camps as the Opposition is, and their division has become very clear from how its people have reacted to this Report.

Now the wider question is how is the industrial policy of this country to grow and how we are going to increase production. Before the British came, there was very little industry in this country and that was in private hands ; mainly with two or three business houses which had taken the initiative in those matters. When the British left, we were very much backward in the industrial field and we wanted that we should develop our economy, develop our industry, at a very fast pace. For that purpose, the Government of India passed some Resolutions, as also the Industries Development Act, wherein it was clearly laid down that we were going to have a mixed economy, i.e., that the private enterprise will be allowed to proceed but the State also will come in. In a developing economy, that is quite natural and necessary too. There are certain fields in which private capital is not available and private enterprise is not available and so, the State should come in. That was in the beginning. But in course of time, as the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, began to get infatuated with the so-called socialism, the balance that had been properly struck began to be given up and more and more stress began to be laid on the public sector, and to that end attempts were made to drive out the private enterprise from the field. For that purpose, a number of administrative measures were

adopted and one of them was this licensing.

As things have grown, the public sector has been growing very fast. Of the total public investment available in this country, about 60 per cent is going to the public sector, and out of the 40 per cent that is left, about 20 to 25 per cent goes to agriculture and small industries and only 15 to 20 per cent is left for the medium scale industry which is run by the so-called private business houses and other industrialists.

The thing which is really important in this regard is whether these private enterprises and private industrialists and the public sector industries can work together or not. Actually we have so much leeway to make up that there is enough scope for both the public sector and the private sector to co-exist and co-operate to develop the country. But actually, instead of co-operating, they are trying to pull each other's legs. Since the public sector has the advantage of being the State sector, being the pet-wife, the private sector is being victimised in every possible way and things are being done or said which, I do not think, are fair to anybody. There are defects and those defects should be removed. But one thing, we must remember, and that is that these two have to go together.

Ours is a democracy and democracy is based on free thinking. Where there is no free thinking, there can be no free expression, there can be no free association.

Therefore, we must have free thinking. There can be no free thinking without free living. If I am dependent for my living on somebody else, then I cannot have free thinking ; If one's living is in the hands of the State or somebody else, then he cannot think and act freely. Therefore, a free economy is a necessary con-



comitant of democracy.

Some people talk very glibly about democratic socialism. I wonder what they mean by this term. If they mean social justice, just as there is in Western Europe, I have no quarrel with it, and I stand for it. But if they think, as my Hon. friends from the Communist Party think, that socialism is what prevails in China or in Russia, then I would say that democracy and socialism are incompatible; they cannot go together. I can understand their anxiety that private sector and private enterprise should be completely ruled out and everything should come under State control because they want that everything should be under State control and the State should be run by a party which will be the only party, and no other party will be allowed to exist. Actually, when everybody is under State control, there will be no scope for any other party. That is why there is no Opposition party in Russia or in China; there is no Opposition party in any communist country. I can understand their thinking that way. But I ask those who do believe in democracy how they reconcile democracy on the one side with socialism on the other. The two are irreconcilable. The two are incompatible.

I agree that in a developing economy, you cannot rule out the State coming in; *laissez-faire* is an outmoded thing; it cannot come back. But the State must come in only when it must and where private enterprise is not available, and whenever it comes it must come as a competitor and not as a monopolist. Monopoly is bad. Tatas' monopoly is bad. Birlas' monopoly is bad. But State monopoly is worse. Wherever there is concentration of economic power it is bad. But when there is

concentration of economic and political powers in the same hands, then it becomes the greatest monster. We know what is happening in China and Russia. Therefore, we must prevent political and economic power getting concentrated in the hands of the State. I am opposed to political and economic power getting concentrated in the hands of some individuals. But if the nation is vigilant, if we are really democratic then we can check it. But if the State gets all the power, who is going to check the State because the State will finish everybody?

So, the basic question is whether we are going to remain a democracy or whether we are going to deteriorate into a dictatorship of one party which controls all the means of production and distribution. We are not going to allow the latter. I think the Congress Party also understands this thing barring a few fellow-travellers who are there in that party.

When you want to reserve a big section or a big part of industry for the public sector, then it means that a small part remains with private industry or private enterprise. And this has been given effect to through the system of licensing. Naturally, some established houses, some who had technical know-how and managerial skill with them and who had money with them had a superiority over the others. I do agree with my Hon. friends that they might have abused their position also. In this country, as things are, a man with a long purse and a man with a long pull has an advantage over others, and naturally, the big business-houses which have a long purse and a long pull have some advantages over others. But for that the Government are more to blame. It is the system that we have established. The bureaucracy and the system of licensing that we have



established, that have helped such people with big purses or as could afford to corrupt the officials. Therefore, if the blame has to be put anywhere, it has to be put on Government. It was the Government which gave the licences. Why had they not simplified the process? Why did they not see that the process had helped some and put a premium on some people and put some people to a disadvantage? Therefore, if anybody is to be charged, then it is the Government which has to be charged.

An attack has been made on certain business houses. I do not hold brief for anybody. But one thing is clear that it is these business houses which put India on the industrial map of the world. Think of this country and of what it was when the British left. It was the Tatas and it was the Birlas and it was the other industrialists who had done yeoman's service to industrialise it. Even now they are doing it. With technological advance, there is a need for bigger industries, and there is a need for bigger concerns which can spend money on research and on technical know-how and which can compete with the latest technical developments in other parts of the world. We are not living in isolation. Therefore, we cannot completely do away with large concerns. When we talk of large concerns, then certainly some houses or some business concerns have to be large. But they are not large compared to the business-houses that are there in other parts of the world. Even the other day I had read in the newspapers that two big electrical concerns, namely the GEC and AEI, had combined together even though each one of them was a very big concern by itself, because they felt that if they could come together, their cost of production would become less, and their

sales organisation would become better and they would be able to spend more on improvements.

When you condemn these big houses, I would ask you to remember one thing. You say they are corrupt. I agree they may be corrupt. You say licences have been given to relatives. May be correct. You say that they are making use of their money to get licences. May be true. But after spending all this money, are they not showing some profits? They are not becoming a burden on the public exchequer. On the other hand, what is happening to our public sector concerns? We have invested so much money in these undertakings. But their cost of production is not less, rather it is more. Every year we, the tax-payers, have to pay for their losses. The Finance Minister in his budget speech told us the other day that the public sector steel plants have incurred a loss of Rs. 41 crores in one year.

Compare these two things. May be the private sector people are bad. Even though they are bad, they are developing the country. At the same time, they are not putting any unnecessary burden on the tax-payer while in the public sector, due to their corruption, inefficiency and high cost of production, the whole burden has to be borne by the people, the tax-payers.

Therefore, in this matter, we have to take a balanced view. What is that view? I think in this respect, Dr. Hazari has some good suggestions. He has suggested that we must reserve some sector for small industries. He has suggested that small entrepreneurs who want to start a small industry in some town or provincial capital should not be forced to come to the Centre and run from pillar to post for getting foreign exchange. The foreign exchange needed by them should be given to



them on the spot by the Director of Industries. This is a good suggestion.

Our experience is that wherever you put authority in one man, there is chance of corruption. So instead of giving that power solely to the Director of Industries, there should be a committee which should include some industrialists, some economists and some officials. They should disburse the foreign exchange, according to the needs of each individual case.

In this matter, we have to reserve a field of production for small industry. If in the same field there is a small man and a big industrialist, the latter will drive the former out of the field. In this country, it is not a question of production alone. What we need is more employment also. This aspect cannot be overlooked. Therefore, while we have to produce more, we have to do it in such a way that more hands are put to work to produce it. This employment aspect is very very important.

Hence we must reserve a section for small industries. For example, we did something in this direction by laying down that 'dhotis' should be produced only in the handloom sector. But even there, the mills have come in. Such production must be reserved for small sector, for which licensing is not needed and much foreign exchange is also not needed. These industries should grow in small towns so that the employment potential may also grow.

The second suggestion he has made—again a good one—is that the big industrial houses should not be given licences for the traditional type of industries; they should use their technical know-how and resources for developing new lines. There is a lot of scope for them.

Why should Tatas and Birlas be allowed to open soap or textile factories? Let the smaller people do it. Let the big houses use their know-how and resources for tapping new lines for which we still depend on imports from abroad.

Thirdly, Dr. Hazari has suggested that in the matter of imports, we should be liberal, that those things which are very costly to produce here should be imported. For example, if we could get an item for one dollar from abroad whereas to produce it here costs  $1\frac{1}{2}$  or 2 dollars, it is better we import that item, because we need not make the common man suffer for our inefficiency or failure to run industry in the proper way at the right time. Therefore, on items in which indigenous production is much more costly, we should be liberal in the matter of imports for some time.

Fourthly, he has said that the limit for requiring a licence should be increased. Licences may not be needed for industries requiring capital of a crore or less. Again, for industries which need no foreign exchange, there need be no licence. We may lay down priorities and capacities and within these priorities, if anybody wants to set up an industry, he should be allowed. Instead of discouraging them, we should encourage them. If foreign exchange, which is scarce, is involved, if considerations of national security are involved, these industries can be properly regulated.

A suggestion has been made that banks should be nationalised. Apart from the merits and demerits of that suggestion, so long as you stand for mixed economy; so long as some industries will be in the public sector and some in the private sector, how on earth can you take away the means of investment from the hands



of private sector? This cannot happen. Those who say that they want nationalisation of banks are those who want a totalitarian regime and complete state control of all economic activity. Most Congressmen do not want it because that cuts at the root of democracy. By making this suggestion Dr. Hazari has not only transgressed his terms of reference; he has shown his ideological predilections which make him suspect; he should not have done so. Had he confined himself to the terms of reference, there would not be any grouse against him.

Then, what is our experience of nationalisation of other industries? Take insurance, for instance. There is more corruption, more inefficiency—all at the cost of the tax-payer.

So far our industries and our economic activities have been controlled by two groups—the organised capital through its power of money and organised labour through its power of blackmail. Somebody controls the former; and somebody else the latter. I represent neither of them but the common man, the consumer, who is the sufferer. 95 per cent of the people are consumers. It is they who ultimately suffer. I say that the economic policy and the industrial policy of this country must neither be capital-oriented nor labour-oriented. It must be consumer-oriented; it should look after the interests of consumers. The controversies about left and right, about socialism and capitalism and other things are all irrelevant. Actually there should be only one ism; that is Indianism. We should look at these things from the Indian point of view. We must look into the conditions under which we are living and formulate our policies accordingly. Whether these

policies affect adversely capitalism, communism or socialism—is irrelevant ; what is relevant is whether these policies serve our country. A national and rational approach is needed and ideological considerations and political considerations should be kept in the background.

We should not find scapegoats and go witch-hunting. The big industrial houses have done a great service to the country. If there is any corruption or weakness, remove it. They are mainly in the system. Simplify the licensing system and improve the administration and remove the defects. Finding scapegoats will serve nobody. I think this country and this House owe it to Birlas and Tatas for putting this country on the industrial map of the world. Today while we are begging everywhere, we can also be proud that there are some countries which come to us, to Birlas and Tatas, inviting them to come and open industries in their countries. That raises our prestige. Do not tar everybody with one brush. If there are mistakes and shortcomings and failures, remove them with a strong hand but do not indulge in witch-hunting. That is my request.



# Automation and Unemployment

[Speech delivered on 31.3.67]

There are a number of economic problems facing India today. The most important of them are backwardness of our agriculture, unemployment, and continual spurt in prices. These are the basic problems of the Indian economic life and are inter-related. Relatively, the problem of unemployment is more important and pressing.

We do suffer from shortage of food grains. But the World has become small due to improvement in means of communication and transportation and so we can get them from other countries. The basic question, therefore, is not shortage of food but the lack of purchasing power in the people. Even today when there is a famine in Bihar and people are dying of hunger, plenty of food grains are available in shops only if the people could pay the price of it.

It is, therefore, not the dearth of food grains but the lack of purchasing power which has created famine conditions there. Why do the people not have the purchasing power? Because they have no work to do. It is why whenever famine conditions arise test works are started to provide work to the people on the clear assumption that the wages given to them for the work done will give them the necessary purchasing power to buy grains. It is, therefore, clear that food can be made available if the people can be given the purchasing

power through money which in its turn can come only if they have work to do.

Viewed in this light, the basic test of the success or failure of the economic policies that we have been following is whether they have increased the employment potential by providing work to the people or not, whether they have succeeded in reducing unemployment or not. Judged by this test, I regret to say that our economic policies and economic plans have failed miserably. According to the statistics given by the Planning Commission itself, there are 13 million unemployed people in the country. Another thirty millions are only partially employed. The actual position is even worse than what is indicated by these figures.

We in this country have excess of manpower and shortage of capital. Therefore, it is essential that our economic thinking, policies and plans should be based on the considerations of providing work to more and more hands. The increase in production must be brought about with the help of more hands. But it is a matter of regret that we have been following quite an opposite policy. There is no co-relation between our malady and the remedy that is being applied. Automation is a glaring example of this contradiction.

The USA, UK, USSR and other countries of the West have taken recourse to automation because they have shortage of manpower and labour and excess of capital. Their economy, therefore, has to be capital intensive. They invest capital to produce such machines and gadgets as may replace the man. They are labour-saving machines and devices. It is wrong to read any other meaning in the use of such devices. The following passage from a statement of Mr. Thomas Watson, CC-0. Nanaji Deshmukh Library, BJP, Jammu. Digitized by eGangotri



Chairman of I.B.M. Corporation of USA brings this fact out clearly. I quote :

“We cannot argue that technological change and automation are no labour-saving devices. Of course they are. They do cause displacement of people. In fact, to do so is one of their major purposes.”

We have an unlimited supply of educated and uneducated workers who do not have any work to do, who are running from pillar to post for getting gainful employment. Still we are bringing in automation which adds to unemployment.

When the attention of this House was drawn to this aspect of automation some days back, the Hon'ble Finance Minister had said that no retrenchment would be done because of automation. But when he was asked whether it would not affect the employment potential, the scope for future employment he tried to evade the issue by giving round about answers. The Government will have to give a straight answer to this question. If they take to automation in Life Insurance Corporation, surely the work now being done by forty thousand workers will be done by fewer hands and thousands of workers will become surplus.

To throw people out of work or to close the doors for future employment through automation at a time when unemployment is growing and increasing number of people are seeking work cannot be called sound economics. Such an economic policy can be justified neither on economic grounds nor on moral grounds. It is not in the interest of the country. We are only trying to blindly imitate the West. That is why I sometimes feel that our rulers belong to the Slave Dynasty. Their thinking and actions closely follow the thinking of USA,

USSR and other Western countries. They forget that conditions of those countries are quite different and they formulate their policies in the light of their own economic realities. But our leaders and bureaucrats think they must have computers because they are used in the advanced countries of the West. They do not realize that our conditions, our realities are quite different and that they demand a labour intensive and not capital intensive economy.

We do not have enough of capital. We beg for it from foreign countries. But we do not use what we have. We want to keep our vast manpower out of work. What kind of policy is this ?

We gave the slogan, "Aram Haram Hai"—rest is rust. But when people ask for work we make such plans as cut down even the existing work potential. I would, therefore, submit to the Honourable Finance Minister to look upon this problem from the wider aspect of its effect on the employment potential of the country. If he does so, he will come to the conclusion that automation must be stopped.

Another argument advanced in favour of automation particularly in the Life Insurance Corporation is that it will help in giving better service to policy-holders. It is wrong to think that automation in itself will result in better service to them. If the policy-holders do not get efficient service the reason for it are to be found elsewhere. The main reason for the inefficiency in L.I.C. is its top heavy bureaucratic structure. The workers at lower rung feel that whatever they may do or not do the officers are going to do whatever they like. Therefore, they lose the initiative, enthusiasm and the feeling that they are working for the society and the



country.

The second reason for inefficiency in L.I.C. is its over-centralisation. It has set up big offices in Bombay, Calcutta and some other big cities. But if we have to popularize insurance in our country, then we should be clear in our mind that small people, the kisans and the workers will have to be made insurance minded. That demands de-centralization of the entire working of Life Insurance. Smaller offices will have to be opened in the interior. Only then the small policy holders will be able to get efficient and quick service from the L.I.C.

# The Language Problem

[Speech delivered on 16.12.1967 on the occasion of Third Reading of the Language Bill].

The form in which this bill has been brought before this House is not acceptable to my party. Had the amendments moved by us been accepted this bill would have become really helpful in settling the language controversy for good. I am sorry that the Government have not accepted them.

If I oppose this bill, it is not because I am a 'Hindi Wala' or because my mother tongue is Hindi. My mother tongue is Punjabi and, therefore, I am as much a non-Hindi Wala as many others in this House. Therefore, it would be wrong to say that all those whose mother tongue is not Hindi are opposed to Hindi. In a way it amounts to doing injustice and hurling insult on them. The question is not what is good for those whose mother tongue is Hindi or for those whose mother tongue is not Hindi but what is good for the country as a whole.

We are not going to settle the problem of official language today. That was settled eighteen years back when we gave us our constitution and accepted Hindi to be our official language. Hindi is our National language. That way Tamil, Kannada, Punjabi, in fact, all our regional languages, are national languages. But the official language of this country is Hindi. There can be no two opinions about that. If that decision has not



been implemented so far, if there are any really guilty men in this respect, they are none else but these very Congress Ministers. They have been playing hide and seek with the Indian Constitution all these years. Had these people been loyal to the Constitution, the situation that we face today would have not arisen at all.

Pandit Nehru had very inadequate knowledge of Hindi. He wanted English to continue and has bequeathed assurances to that intent. I used to say even during his life-time that so long as Pt. Nehru lives, this country cannot get rid of English and after his death, nobody will be able to retain English, in the position that it has held all these years, any more. I am happy that this bill which has been brought forth in the name of implementing Pt. Nehru's assurances in regard to English has started the process of elimination of English from this country. It is the beginning of the end. Looked from that angle, the starting of this process to end domination of English in the name of implementation of Nehru assurances cannot be any consolation to Pt. Nehru's soul but it might satisfy those who want to do everything in the name of Pt. Nehru.

I am not opposed to English language. I have written a number of books and thousands of articles in English. I have written good many books in Hindi as well. I do not raise slogans in favour of Hindi. I serve Hindi by creating literature in it. English will continue in this country. It will have a special place in India as the most important of all the foreign language for us. There are historical reasons for that. But the position that it occupies in the country today cannot continue. No doubt many members including myself, sometimes speak in English in this House. But neither they nor I have

any real command over English. We speak it for historical reasons. But that does not warrant that we should accept it as our language...

We do not object to the continuance of English for some time more. But the most objectionable thing in this bill is that it has not fixed any time limit for the change-over. It would have been better if some time-limit, ten, fifteen or twenty years, had been laid down in this bill. Ten or twenty years do not make a very long period in the life of a nation. But it would not be proper to impose a foreign language on the country for an indefinite period. A definite time limit should be incorporated in this bill.

Another objectionable thing in this bill is the right of veto to a State or States which may like to continue English for an indefinite period. The Hon'ble Home Minister had explained yesterday that that was not his intention. But we must not forget that once a right is given to any State, it is bound to develop a vested interest in it. The example of Kashmir is there before us. When permission was sought to introduce temporary Article 370 in the constitution, late Shree Gopalaswami Aiyanger who made the motion had said that this temporary Article be a short lived thing. But we all know that certain vested interests have grown round this Article 370 in Kashmir which want to retain it for all time. I would, therefore, submit that we should not accept any wrong thing today. No State should be given the right of veto. I am sure that people of Madras will also give up English. There its place will be taken by Tamil. But a couple of lakh of people of Nagaland who are under the influence of foreign missionaries may like to continue English indefinitely. It would be very wrong to give

CC-0. Nanaji Deshmukh Library, BJP, Jammu. Digitized by eGangotri



the right to this State of 3 lakh people to keep English imposed over the whole country.

We do not want Hindi to be imposed on anybody. But at the same time we do not want English to be imposed on us.

To my friends of the D.M.K. I want to say that we are conscious of the difficulties of those who do not know Hindi. We want to consider their difficulties and their sentiments sympathetically. But we too have our difficulties and sentiments. If we consider our mutual difficulties in the right spirit, we may arrive at the conclusion that English too will have to be continued for some time. But English cannot be allowed to remain in the present position for all times.

It has been proposed that the Union Public Service Commission should conduct its examination in all the regional languages. It is a commendable resolution. It is good that this has been accepted in principle. But when will it come in operation? It has been said that its implementation should be left to the Union Public Service Commission. But I want to submit that left to themselves, members of U.P.S.C. would like neither Hindi nor Tamil nor Bangla to come. The decision regarding this will have to be taken by us here in this House and steps will have to be taken to implement it without delay.

When people of Tamilnad will be able to come to the Central Services through examinations conducted in Tamil and when Andhras, Kannadas and Malyalees would likewise be able to come in the Central Services through examinations conducted in their respective languages, then much of the existing misunderstanding and opposition to Hindi and other Indian languages will automati-

cally disappear.

Before I conclude I want to make one thing clear. This bill will no doubt get through. But it is a matter of real satisfaction that this bill has roused the latent patriotism, nationalism and sense of national self respect in this country. This is a big gain.

It is a matter of regret that patriotic spirit so eloquently expressed in Scott's well known lines "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself hath said : This is my own, my native land" had been forgotton in this country. The feeling that this my country and this is my language had been suppressed by the Congress rulers during the last twenty years. But this bill has re-awakened that feeling. I do not support the hooliganism that took place at some places. I strongly condemn it. But there is no doubt in my mind that the popular awakening created by this bill is going to end domination of English over our country.

Let the Government and the devotees of English understand this clearly.

It is therefore essential that we honestly accept and implement the decision regarding official language that we had taken eighteen years back both at Central and State level. The Central Government can and should give a lead in the matter.

The passing of this bill in itself will take us nowhere. We will have to open Central Universities in non-Hindi States wherein higher education could be imparted through Hindi. We will have to create motivation for Hindi like the one that exists for English today. The constitution has no doubt given a special place to Hindi But in practice it does not enjoy that position. This bill accepts that special position of Hindi. But that



## THE LANGUAGE PROBLEM

alone will not serve the purpose so long as the people do not feel some motivation to read Hindi. That motivation must be created. My party will support you in such an endeavour. You can count on our support for anything that is in the best interests of the nation and which helps in maintaining and strengthening her unity. But, for God's sake, do not do anything on partisan basis which may temporarily help your party at the cost of lasting damage to the country.

# National Policy on Education

[Speech in Lok Sabha on 5.12.67]

Education is the most important constructive activity that the State has to undertake, because it is through education that we mould the minds of men, of those who ultimately make the nation and make its policies. Man is the most important factor in all human affairs, it is the ultimate factor, and that, which makes the man, is the most important and most constructive activity, and that is the role of education.

Unfortunately, in this country, education has come to be treated as the most neglected subject and it is a step-son in this House. Nobody is giving any attention to it.

When the British were here, they gave us a system of education which was not suited to our needs at all. Those who are conversant with Lord Macaulay's Minute on Education know what was the objective of the educational system they gave. Their objective was not to educate the people of India, not to develop India culturally, socially or economically; their aim was to create a class of Indians who will be Indians in blood and colour, in bone and flesh, but who will be English in mind. Their object was to create *manasputra*—mental slaves of the British, and also to create clerks to run the administration. To that end, Lord Cornwallis announced in 1784 that only those who know English will be taken into the service of the East India Company, and that



way a motivation was created through which English came to be imposed on the whole country. The aim was not to educate the common people. It was argued that education will infiltrate, will percolate, to the lower rungs ; because they were not interested in educating the common people at all. Because they were not interested in educating the common people, so the languages of the country had no place in it and English was imposed that way.

During the last one hundred years of British rule this system of education continued. If we look at the Convocation Addresses delivered by eminent national leaders during that period, in every address this system of education and retention of English as medium of instruction was condemned and it was stated that we should have education through our own languages. And if this educational system did not succeed completely in denationalising India, the credit does not go to this system of education, the credit does not go to the Britishers, but the credit goes to the great Indian culture, the great savants of India like Rishi Dayanand, Lokmanya Tilak, Mahadev Govind Ranade and Aurobindo Ghosh. While getting the best of the Western education through this system they maintained their roots in India's soil and her great cultural past.

It was the blend of the old and the new that they created which was able to give a new life to this country. But the British did succeed partially. They were able to create a new class also which was more English than Indian. Just as Lokmanya Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh and Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee represented the class which had the best of the West and at the same time

maintained their roots, we had Pandit Nehru who was only English and nothing Indian at all. Therefore, we had two classes.

Now, if any good has come out of it, it is not because of those Indians who were the products of Macaulay but because of those Indians who, in spite of Macaulay, remained Indians and continued to have their touch with Indian culture and life.

When the British were gone and India became free, we thought that now at least a national system of education would be evolved. But, unfortunately, during the first 19 years of our freedom our education remained in the hands of people who were anything but Indian. I say it with full sense of responsibility. Maulana Azad might have been a great man but he did not know anything about Indian education—in that matter he was more Arab than an Indian just as Pandit Nehru was more English than an Indian. In these people's hand, therefore, education could not make progress. Those very things which were condemned during British rule came to be praised as something noble during these 19 years. I am happy that for the first time we have an Education Minister who is a real Indian and a real educationist. He knows India; he knows India's cultural heritage and he knows what is education. Therefore for the first time we are evolving a national policy on education.

The Kothari Commission Report is a big one. It was there before us for a long time but, I think, it was a very laudable decision to appoint a committee of Members of Parliament to go into it and make a considered report on it. That is what we call the national policy on education which we are discussing today.



I wish the same course is adopted in other matters also. In this country we do not have a national foreign policy or a national economic policy. Policies are evolved by a group of people, who really do not represent the people. In fact they are cut off from Indian life, but because somehow they manage to have a majority in this House they think that what they decide is a national policy. Actually, these policies are not national at all. If national policies are evolved in the way in which an attempt has been made to evolve a national policy on education, I think, many of the ills in the economic and other fields also could be removed.

What does the statement on national policy on education which has been circulated to the Members of Parliament, say ? It deals with all the aspects of education. It clearly defines the aims of a national system of education. One is that education should aim to build up the nation, to create in the new generation a spirit of nationalism and patriotism and imbibe in them moral values and prepare them to face the challenge of the modern times in the field of science and technology. It has to be adjusted to the new social conditions and economic needs but, at the same time, it has to maintain the cultural and moral climate of the country. It must preserve the genius and distinctiveness for which India has been known all through the ages.

For that purpose four main recommendations have been made. One is that the status of the teachers should be improved. I do not think there can be any two opinions about that. In our country all through the ages the teacher has not been known for his riches. The Brahmin, according to Manu Smriti, may have anything

but he should not be rich ; a rich Brahmin becomes worse than a Bania. Therefore, a teacher whose role has been that of a Brahmin has never been a very rich man : he has never been given very high emoluments. But he enjoyed a status in the country. Everybody respected him. But during the last 20 years, because we have polluted our own moral values and have been talking too much about materialism, the teacher who is poorly paid has lost even that status. The result is that today the teacher has neither food nor status which could somewhat compensate for not having food. Therefore, it is very important that the teacher must have enough to eat and he should enjoy a status in society. For that purpose a number of recommendations made in the report need to be carefully considered and implemented.

In this respect, I would lay stress particularly on one thing and that is housing. We have teachers who go to long distances for teaching ; they do not have any place to live there and they have to come back 8 or 10 miles. This is not fair to them, considering their poor emoluments. Wherever a school or college is made, we must see that living quarters for the teachers are also made, so that the teacher can devote his leisure to studies and his time is not wasted in walking long distances. This is a thing which is particularly very necessary in metropolitan towns.

The second recommendation that we have made is about the reform in the system of examinations. The examinations that we have now are just a sort of machine and the real worth of the student can be seldom judged through it. If a boy can use a key effectively or can



cram effectively, he can always get through very well. Therefore, this system needs to be improved. In this Report we have suggested that some kind of internal assessment also should be taken into consideration and the results should be declared on the basis of internal and external assessments. This is a recommendation which should be given some fair trial and I think, through it, we will be able to improve our system of assessment of the boys.

The third recommendation that we have made in this Report is about neighbourhood schools. We recommended in this Report that in the primary stage at least, all the boys coming from a particular neighbourhood or a particular area should go to the school of that area, whether they are rich or poor, whether one is the son of Shrimati Indira Gandhi or the other is the son of the peon of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, they should be able to go and read in one school, so that they can understand that Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her peon belong to the same country, though one was born with a silver spoon in her mouth and the other was born with an earthen spoon in his mouth. This is very important and this is also in keeping with the slogan that has been raised in this country so often but which has never been acted upon, the slogan of socialism. If we want to create a sense of unity in our younger people in the society, it has to be imbibed in their hearts first, and this can be done only through education. But unfortunately some of the people who talk too much about democracy and Constitution have said that it will go against the Fundamental Rights. I wonder what they mean by Fundamental Rights. Here is the Constitution of India and in the

very Preamble, we have said that we, the people of India, solemnly resolve to secure to all our citizens equality of status and opportunity. We want the equality of status and opportunity. But where can be equality of status and opportunity when the son of a rich man can go to a school where he gets a special treatment and the son of a peon, a poor man, cannot afford to go to a better school? No rich man will send his son, no Minister will send his son, no Secretary will send his son to an ordinary school and, therefore, the standard of these schools goes on falling further. They say that St. Columbus School gives good education. Why? It is because every parent pays handsomely whenever they want donations, and every pupil has to pay Rs. 100, or more as tuition fee. If the rich people of a particular area give the same attention to their own Municipal School or Government School, give donations to it and meet its other needs, then that school can also be improved. In the area in which I live, namely, Rajendra Nagar, I find that in the early morning hundreds of boys get ready to go to far-off schools. I ask them, when there are so many primary schools, why don't they send their children there? They pay high fees also. I tell the parents that if they spend a fraction of the money that they spend on their wards reading in missionary and public schools on the school that we have in our locality, we can improve that school. That is the only way of doing it. If that is not done and if some people say that it will infringe on the Fundamental Rights, then the rich will live in Heavens and the poor will live in the purgatory for all times, and this, the people of India are not going to tolerate. There-



fore, the system of neighbourhood school is a very very commendable thing and it must be implemented without any further delay or hesitation.

I am happy to say that the Administration of Delhi, which is in the hands of my Party, has already started acting upon this principle. We have some good schools to which boys used to come from all parts of the city and, therefore, only good boys could get into such schools and the boys who did not come from happy families or rich families in the neighbourhood could not get admission in those schools. Now we have laid down that the school must give preference to the boys of neighbourhood and only when boys from the neighbourhood are not available, should they admit boys from distant areas. The result is that the boys of poor families with less marks can also go to better schools and improve their qualifications. We have tried this system in Delhi and it can be tried in all the cities. This is a problem mainly of cities and I see no reason why this should not be tried in other cities as well.

I can understand the opposition of men like Shri Anthony because for them it is a commercial proposition. They run schools in which rich boys come and pay high fees. If neighbourhood school system comes into being, their business will not run. It is none of our business to see that the business of some people is run properly, at the cost of community as a whole and at the cost of the future of our younger generation. Therefore, I think we should not pay any attention to the arguments that Shri Anthony put forth the other day.

The most important recommendation of this Commission has been that we should switch on to the regional languages as media of instruction. I say,

it is the most unexceptionable thing that the world all over has adopted. I am a teacher of long standing and I know that we cannot educate our children through a foreign language, like English, which is perhaps the most ticklish of them. There was a time when we had a few students in the colleges and schools, we had teachers who had been foreign-trained and who could impart better instruction in English. Now, when we have mass education, the standard of teaching English is falling very fast. You look at the results of any school or college in Delhi, you will find that most of our boys fail in English even though as many as 18 periods are provided for instruction in English and only 6 periods for Hindi. If these 18 periods are not imposed on them and they are distributed to the study of Hindi, and other subjects, I think, our boys will do much better.

I have gone all over the world and I have discussed the question of Indian students with the leading educationists in other countries and I find that Indian students are second to none in intelligence, rather they are better. I was glad to see them doing very well everywhere. But why are they not able to make any original research? The simple reason is that no real genius can flower through a foreign language. If this imposition of English goes, then you will see that the Indian boys will make a mark in all fields. Look at the original papers that are published every year. The share of India is not even 1% of the original papers in the scientific subjects that are published. The reason is not that the Indian boys are less intelligent, but because they cannot do that original research in a foreign language. The moment you switch on to your own lang-



uage then all these things will go.

My friends in the DMK and others are unhappy over this switch over and they want that English in any case should continue. My appeal to them would be that English is neither their language nor my language. It is a foreign language. English was imposed on this country by our colonial rulers.

I know there are difficulties in the South. They cannot switch on to Hindi immediately, but they can switch on to Tamil and Telugu immediately.

*An Hon'ble Member* : We are doing that.

*Shri Balraj Madhok* : We do not want that Hindi should be imposed on any State.

*An Hon'ble Member* : Thank you.

*Shri Balraj Madhok* : Let people study in their own language and if they feel the motivation, let them read Hindi as well. I hope they will read Hindi. In any case I would make an appeal to them : 'Don't impose English on others who are sick of it and who are suffering because of it'.

I would submit : Let us adopt a rational and national approach. Let us impose neither Hindi nor English on anybody. Let us make provision for teaching both Hindi and English and let there be no compulsion about the knowledge of Hindi or English for entry into a Government service. Any one who wants to enter Government service should know either English or Hindi, preferably both. And if we do that, I think, in course of time, the Indian genius will automatically evolve a system in which all these difficulties which we find at the moment can be removed.

Some difficulties are bound to come up when we switch on to regional languages. To meet them we have sug-

gested that there should be a common dictionary of technical terms and such technical terms should be drawn from all the Indian languages and whenever textbooks are prepared in Tamil, Kashmiri or Bengali, the technical terms should be the same. Secondly, we have suggested that the Central Government should open Central Schools and Colleges in which education should be given through English and Hindi so that the people serving in the Armed forces and other services who are transferable from one place to another, do not find any difficulties in educating their children. Thirdly, we have said that in the institutions of higher education like the Central Institution of Education or Central Institute of Medical Sciences here in Delhi or elsewhere, the medium should continue to be for some time Hindi and English. Fourthly, we have suggested that even in the matter of admission into Public Services, we should have these languages as the media of examination so that nobody suffers because of this change-over. If these precautionary measures are taken I do not think that the switch over to Hindi or the regional languages will pose any danger to Indian unity. In fact, those who think that Indian unity has been there because of English are sadly mistaken. It is not English which unites India. It is geography that unites India. It is our great culture which unites India. India was one when there was no English, we always have had a lingua franca. That role was played first by Sanskrit and then by Pali Prakrit for some time, and that role has been played for the past few hundred years by Hindi. Hindi is the lingua franca of our country. I am not saying so in a partisan spirit. My mother-tongue is not Hindi



but Punjabi. But it is important to remember that the *khadiboli* Hindi which we have adopted as the official language ; is not the spoken language of any part of the country except perhaps Delhi and the nearby areas. Therefore those who think that the adoption of Hindi will give advantage to people of certain areas are mistaken ; it would not give any advantage to me, nor would it give any advantage to people from the other so-called Hindi States.

Therefore, in the matter of the change-over to the regional languages as the media of instruction, I think the recommendations of this commission must be accepted by all without any reservations or fears.

Now, I would like to say a few words about the UGC whose report also we are considering. So far, it has played the role only of doling out grants-in-aid to different universities. It must play a wider role in laying down the guidelines for the educational development and expansion. My concrete suggestions in this regard are :

1. We should cut down expenses on buildings. We are spending too much on buildings now, and we can have simpler buildings instead.
2. Secondly, we should scrap the system of preceptorials. The preceptorial system which has been introduced in some universities and colleges is just a waste of time and money. That money could be diverted for opening more colleges.
3. My third suggestion is that we should not go on multiplying autonomous institutions. For example, in Delhi we have the School of International Studies which has the status of a university ; then

we have the Jamia Milia which has again the status of a university ; then, we have the Institute of Humanities at Simla which acts as our autonomous body. Why should we have so many autonomous bodies ? We are going to open the Nehru University in Delhi. All these institutions should become part of the Nehru University, and in that way not only money will be saved but also there will be better co-ordination of the work that they are doing.

4. New Universities should be opened only in those areas where there are special situations which warrant such a step. For example, in the hill areas of Himachal Pradesh and U.P. we need a separate university. Then, there is a suggestion for the opening of Dayanand University at Ajmer. Ajmer is a very big educational centre which has been neglected all these years by the Rajasthan Government. So we should have a university at Ajmer.

5. Lastly, I would suggest that the Government should cut down the expenditure on and intake of engineering colleges so long as they cannot provide employment to the engineers coming out of the existing colleges and institutions.

In conclusion, I would say that we should set up a permanent committee of Members of Parliament to supervise the working and implementation of this national policy on education. This is essential if this Policy Statement is not to be consigned to the archives. It must be acted upon.



# Education—Some Concrete Suggestions

[Speech in Lok Sabha on 3.4.1968]

The human factor is said to be the ultimate factor in all human affairs and education is the medium to train that human factor. As such it has the greatest significance and importance, particularly, in a democratic set-up.

The system of education that we inherited from the British was not meant to train the people of this country or to educate them. It was meant to create some clerks for the British administration. Therefore, it was expected that after the British would have withdrawn the system would undergo a radical change. But unfortunately even twenty years after freedom, our educational system continues to be as it was. If anything, it has further deteriorated. For the first 19 years our Education Ministry was presided over by people who had nothing to do with Education at all. Therefore, I need not complain against them. But when Dr. Triguna Sen took over this Ministry last year, hope was created that he is a man who knows something about Education and something will be done. But, the experience of the last one year has shown that Dr. Triguna Sen also has become a prisoner of the system which he has inherited. Either he must change it or he will get lost in it, and it is the country that will suffer by that.

Therefore, my suggestion is that we have to look at the problem of education and the budget of the Education Ministry not through the grooves in which they have been moving so far, but we must do some fresh thinking. I have carefully gone through the report of the Ministry. It makes a sickening reading. It deals with everything except Education. There are so many institutions. There are so many subordinate departments which consume most of its budget and the real scope of the Ministry is not anywhere to be seen. We have no money for real education. If a new look is given in respect of the expenditure incurred by the different departments, I think that there is lot of scope for simplification, for rationalisation and for economy.

Sometime back there was a strike of the school teachers of Delhi. They wanted some more pay and other things. But they were told that we have no money for them. But when I look at the report I find how money is being wasted. There is an Institute of Advanced Studies at Simla. It has been given the Presidential palace there. More than Rs. 11 lakhs have been earmarked for it. What is the real work which it did last year? There were three seminars held, one on Language and Society in which it tried to criticise and condemn the Government for its language policy. Another was on the influence of Islam in Contemporary India. This is all that was done; and it has consumed more than a million rupees of this Education Ministry's budget. Then, we have here in Delhi a Nehru Museum in which some relics of Pandit Nehru are kept. The palatial building of Teen Murti House is being occupied by it



# EDUCATION—SOME CONCRETE SUGGESTIONS

and a budget of Rs 11 lakhs has been earmarked for it also. Why cannot the relics of Pt. Nehru be kept in a room of the National Museum? Why should so much money be wasted there? We have a Jamia-Milia Islamia in Delhi. A grant of Rs. 18 lakhs has been earmarked for it. There are hardly one thousand students studying there. The college from which I come, has more than a thousand students. But it gets Rs. 5 lakhs only from the Government of India as grant. But here is an Institute for which you spend so much money. You have given it Rs. 4 crores during the last 19 years and you are giving Rs. 18 lakhs more. Then, there is the Delhi School of International Studies. It was part of the Delhi University. Now it has been made a separate University and a top-heavy administration is given to it and lot of money is being spent on it. There are Rs. 75 lakhs earmarked for training teachers for polytechnics. There is already a glut of Engineering graduates who cannot get employment, but still here we find that a sum of Rs. 75 lakhs has been earmarked for training teachers for polytechnics. We have Rs. 29 lakhs for a Forging School in Ranchi. We have already the Heavy Electricals on which we have spent Rs. 150 crores. Why cannot the Forging School be a part of Heavy Electricals?

Then, we have the NCERT for which Rs. 2 crores have been earmarked. I have been trying to look into the report as to what work it has been doing. No real, worth while work is being done and yet Rs. 2 crores are being spent on it.

So, a lot of economy can be made if this proliferation of the Education Ministry can be stopped. I know, last year the Education Ministry was able to effect an

economy of about a crore of rupees by ordering that in future the conferences of the Ministry would not be held outside Delhi. I think, he is capable of making more economy also, but then he must get out of this system. The Education Ministry must concentrate only on the work which is meant for it and that is mainly education.

When we come to education, there are two aspects—one is the structure of education and the other is the content of education. When you come to the structure of education, it is primary education which is the base. It is on that base that the entire educational edifice of the country has to be built. But what do we see here? We have had two university commissions and one higher secondary commission but so far there has been no attempt made even to study the problem of primary education in this country. It is growing as a jungle. There is no co-ordination and the primary teacher is the most neglected man in this country. The courses of study also are quite different in different schools.

My first submission is that this Ministry must concentrate on improving primary education in this country. For that purpose I have to make some specific suggestions. One is that you must appoint a primary education commission which should consist of not only some top-heavy vice-chancellors and others but some primary teachers, some public men and some people who come from the rural areas so that it may go into the question of primary education in all its aspects and suggest how we can have a correlated and co-ordinated system of primary education all over the country.



Secondly, we should try to evolve some uniform pattern of recruitment of primary teachers. We must provide them uniform amenities. So far, in some States the primary teacher is being paid Rs. 100 or Rs. 150 but in other States only Rs. 70 or Rs. 80. Most of the funds of the Government must go to improve the lot of the primary teacher. It is the primary teacher who really prepares the base, the foundation, of the student and if primary education is not good nothing is going to come out of it.

We hear the talk of falling standards. To improve standards we give grants to universities and put up buildings and laboratories. They are not going to raise the standard. Until and unless we raise the standard of primary education, we are building the educational edifice of the country on foundations of sand and any building built on foundations of sand cannot stand for long. Therefore, the first thing is that this Ministry must concentrate on building up and improving the system of primary education in the country.

For that purpose I would suggest that primary education at least must become a concurrent subject. The States cannot do it. They do not have the resources. And the State ministries and the politicians there think that if the electorate gets educated they might not get their votes. Therefore, sometimes I wonder whether the people who rule this country are really interested in educating the people of this country. The time has come when we realise that if we do not educate the voters, our masters, democracy is going to go to dogs. Therefore it is very important that primary education should become a concurrent subject and something

should be done to improve it.

Then comes the secondary education. At the secondary stage something has been done but even now much more needs to be done. We need a committee like the UGC which should distribute funds for secondary education all over the country. There should not be a haphazard growth. Secondly, we must make the higher secondary examination the entrance examination for all professional colleges and all public services. This is the only way in which we can make higher secondary education worth while and remove the craze for degrees which is commercialising our higher education.

When we talk of higher education we talk only of universities...open more universities, provide more vice-chancellors and more professors. I entirely agree with what Professor Amin said about the way they are appointed and what they do there. I do not want to repeat what he said, but this is not the way of improving higher education. If you really want to have higher education, you must have good teachers. The standard of education is determined not by buildings or by the pay you give but by the quality of teachers and that is one thing which is not being cared for at all.

We are a poor people. We can do without big buildings. We can have austerity in our education. But what is happening today? The educational institutions, the Universities, are trying to get grants from the Ford Foundation, and such other sources to have big buildings, appoint more staff, pay higher salaries and later on they have no work to do. To increase the expenditure, certain useless things are being introduced. For example, we have the preceptorial system. It has been introduced



in most of the Universities as a result of which staff has been increased by about fifty per cent. What is the result? Actually, it has led to the falling of standards. Very few boys come to the preceptorial class. What is the need of it? I would urge upon you to scrap this preceptorial system and with the money you save you open more colleges and more educational institutions.

Then, we should have more of evening colleges, no more of morning colleges and more of correspondence courses so that those people who are working in offices, who are working in trade, can also improve their education. In Punjab, for example, there are so many people who are first-class technicians and if they get some academic training in engineering, they might prove to be the best engineers. But they have no opportunity. Therefore, they must remain as artisans all their life. A man who knows really nothing about the industry gets a degree and bosses over those who are actually in the trade, the artisans, etc. We must provide more facilities for them to improve their educational qualifications while they are earning also.

Even more important than the structure is the content. What is the content of our education? When the British were ruling they wanted only clerks. So, the education had neither any moral content nor national content. We are a free country now. But even today it lacks both in national content and in moral content. The result is this. Education which should have become an important factor in creating a patriotic and national spirit among our young people is having the opposite effect. Today, we talk of students' indiscipline. I know my students are very good; our youth are not bad. But

what is the education that we are giving them ? Apart from the economic factors, the content of the education itself is a very big factor. There is no moral content in it ; there is no national content in it. The result is that because of this education, only a division is being created between educated and uneducated and, therefore, instead of uniting the society, it is dividing it and is thereby creating many new problems.

Some of the Universities are playing a very very dangerous role. I, particularly, refer here to the Aligarh University. The Aligarh University, as is well-known, was created by the British with a set purpose to create a separatist feeling among the Muslim intelligentsia and they did succeed in that. I think, if the Pakistan ideology was reared anywhere it was in Aligarh. After Pakistan was created, most of the staff and the students of the Aligarh University migrated to Pakistan. Then, it was suggested that the campus of the D.A.V. College, Lahore be exchanged with the campus of the Aligarh University. That was not done. Instead we began to feed the snake and we have spent over Rs. 15 crores on feeding that snake during the last twenty years. What is the result ? This University today has again become the biggest centre of anti-national activities in the country. I have with me a number of reports from that University to substantiate this charge.

When Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri as our Prime Minister went to Aligarh, a street in the University campus was named after him and a stone bearing his name was put up. Some days later, the stone was destroyed. Later on the Municipality put up a stronger stone with the help of iron pillars. That was also destroyed. There is a



Nehru Park in the University in which stood a statue of Mahatma Gandhi. That statue was broken to pieces. They cannot tolerate the name of Mahatma Gandhi; they cannot tolerate the name of Lal Bahadur Shastri; they cannot tolerate the name of even Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. This is the Aligarh University. What they are teaching there is pure Pakistan. In fact, Pakistan could not have a bigger centre of education where Pakistani ideology could be developed and reared. What is worse we are giving more than a crore of rupees as annual grant to that institution, but in Aligarh itself, there are four other degree colleges with the strength of more than 4000 students. But those colleges cannot take any benefit of the grant that we make to the University because they are not affiliated to the Aligarh University. I wonder why cannot these colleges which are in Aligarh city itself be affiliated to that University?

Sometime back, a move was made to change the name and character of this University. It was then demanded that we must change the name and character of the Banaras Hindu University also and remove the word 'Hindu'. Any student of history knows that he who is an Indian is a Hindu. 'Hindu' is not a religious term. The word 'Indian' is a Greek synonym for the word 'Hindu'. Even then, if Aligarh people want a pound of flesh, I do not mind, if you remove the word 'Hindu' from the Banaras Hindu University. But for God's sake, change the character of the Aligarh University if you want to really develop a national cohesion and national unity in this country. Either the Aligarh University should be wiped out or its character must be

completely changed. This is my demand and this is the demand of the whole country.

We had only one Aligarh. But now in Delhi itself, in the Capital city also, we have a branch of Aligarh; I mean the Jamia-Milia Islamia. I congratulate the Education Minister and also the Home Minister that they asserted themselves some months back and for the first time after 20 years of freedom, in this institution which is entirely run by the funds of the Government of India, in which more than 85 per cent of the students are Hindus Sunday has been made the weekly holiday. Till recently it was not Sunday but Friday, and the boys were protesting. Since it falls in my constituency some of the boys approached me. One of those who approached me with this genuine complaint was expelled from the college. He was an M.A. student. His whole career has been ruined because he had the courage and the patriotism to come to me and say, 'Here is an institution which should be closed on Sunday and not on Friday'. This is a scandalous institution. If you go into the whole thing, you will find this. I have tried to study, I have been there; I do not say anything without verifying the facts. Here is an institution in which all the boys belong to one community, but the staff belongs to another community. Recently, Dr. Prasad of the Delhi University was deputed to go into the working of this college and he reported that 90 per cent of the staff of this college came only from Aligarh University, and it is being developed as a branch of the Aligarh University.

I would suggest that a Parliamentary Committee should be set up to inquire into the working of Jamia-Milia. You have given Rs. 4 crores to this one college



during the last 20 years and you are going to give them Rs. 18 lakhs more this year. There is a Vice-Chancellor there; he has been there since 1948; who is not called 'Vice-Chancellor' or '*Kulapati*', but '*Sheikh-ul-Jamia*'. He is the Sheikh of Jamia. Just as we have the Sheikh of Bahrein, we have a Sheikh of Delhi also. This kind of thing cannot be tolerated. I would like to appeal to the Education Minister, and also warn the country that, if they allow this kind of thing to continue in Delhi, they will be spoiling the peace of Delhi, they will be spoiling the educational atmosphere of Delhi, and therefore, it is very urgent that Jamia-Milia must be either cleansed or wiped out.

The best thing would be that it should be affiliated to the Nehru University which is going to be opened shortly. The Jamia Milia, the Indian School of International Studies and the Institute of Advanced Studies, Simla, should be affiliated to the Nehru University. This will save money and will improve their efficiency also.

I would stress that the education is meant to build up the character of the people of our country. It must create a right sense of values in them; it should create a feeling of patriotism in them. For that purpose, it is very essential that the teaching of history must be improved. It is said that if you distort the history of the country, you destroy the nation. In this country what are we teaching? If somebody says that he is a Christian and Clive was a Christian and, therefore, Clive is his hero, and Gandhiji was not a Christian and, therefore, he is a *kafir*, what will you call him? To this country Mohd. Ghaznavi and Mohd. Kasim came

as invaders. Prithviraj Chauhan fought as a leader of this country. I want to know if anybody says that because Prithviraj Chauhan did not belong to his community, he was a *Kafir*, and Mohd. Ghorî belonged to his community and, therefore, he was a great man, he is his hero and all that, is he preaching the right thing? Is he creating integration in this country? Is he creating national unity in this country?

To sum up, I want to say that this unnecessary proliferation of the Education Ministry must be stopped. The Education Ministry must concentrate only on two things: on improving primary education and on correlating the educational work going on in different States and also providing facilities for higher education. For that purpose, it is very important that the Central Education Ministry should run some Central universities in all the regions. We have a few of them already, I would suggest that there must be some Central universities in the South also; there should be a Central university at Chandigarh also. In these universities, the medium should be Hindi and English for the time being but in course of time it may become Hindi alone. Such Central universities and Central schools should be opened all over the country.

Secondly, the Central Education Minister must concentrate on creating the right type of books and literature. I know that more than Rs. 1 crore has been earmarked for this, but nothing has been done so far. I think that if the Government leave it to the salaried staff, nothing will come out of it. They must set up some guilds of scholars with payment on the basis of work done; thereby alone they can produce books and they



can translate books quickly. We must have these books at the earliest so that we can give education through the regional languages.

Thirdly, I would suggest that the Education Minister must be given a free hand, and he should have the courage to assert himself, so that the bureaucratisation, fossilisation and proliferation of the Education Ministry is stopped and it begins to do the job for which it is meant.

# Privy Purses

[Speech on 17.7.1968]

The question of abolition of the privy purses of the ex-princes is not one of the basic issues before the country. It is only a reflection of the inner conflicts with which the ruling Congress Party is afflicted. The protagonists of abolition of privy purses argue that these are being given on the basis of dynastic rights. But in fact they are not bothered so much about the dynastic rights of the princes as they are worried by the imposition on them of a Prime Minister on the basis of dynastic rights. They want to get rid of her. And there is a justification for it because she had no other claim to be the leader of the Congress Party except that her late father was the Prime Minister of India. It is why I say that it would be wrong to treat the question of privy purses as a basic problem.

Furthermore, it is a question of only five crores rupees a year which amount is getting automatically reduced year by year with the death of the older princes one by one. It is, therefore, no problem as compared to the vital external and internal problems facing the country. It seems that some Congress busy bodies have raised this question only to divert the attention of the people from basic questions. Can they enlighten the House how this sum of five crores, even if it is taken away from the princes and distributed among the people in general is



going to make any difference in their standard of living. It is therefore necessary that we look at this question in proper perspective.

Privy purses were guaranteed to the princes when they handed over their States and dynastic rights as rulers to the Government of India. A very difficult situation had arisen at that time. Those who happened to be living in the Princely States at that time and those who know the difficulties being created by the interested parties can appreciate that situation. It is difficult to-day to visualise the picture of India if late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel had not shown statesmanship and tact in dealing with the princes. Actually the people who generally talk of dealing with the princes in a rough and ready manner want to undo the great work of national integration accomplished by Sardar Patel and start the process of disintegration instead. I would appeal to them not to distort the real issue.

It is wrong to drag in the past of the princes or to compare them with the new democratic rulers of the country. There is no question of threat to democracy either. So far as the common people are concerned they have begun to prefer the princes to the new Congress rulers. No Congress leader, however big, can win against a prince in the election. Therefore, there is no question of people's rights, or wishes in this matter.

The real thing is that enjoyment of special rights or privileges by any individual or section of individuals does not fit in well with a democratic system in which every citizen is assured of equal rights by the Constitution. Special rights and privileges whether enjoyed by the princes or new ministers or some body else, there-

fore, appear to be jarring and incongruous.

As a representative of the common people—I do not represent the rich nor are there any princes in my party, I would like the special rights and privileges acquired by the Congress Ministers and others over the last twenty years to go. The princes might have grown fat at the cost of others in the past, but the people now want to be saved from those who are exploiting them in the name of socialism or capitalism. He wants to be saved from exploitation; he wants to preserve his fundamental rights. It is time that we pay heed to this basic question concerning the common people.

So far as the special privileges enjoyed by the princes are concerned, I do not think that they are compatible with the modern democratic temper. But the way they are sought to be done away with is not the correct way. I would like the Home Minister, Shri Yashwant Rao Chavan, who is now occupying the place once adorned by late Sardar Patel to emulate him and follow his method in dealing with the princes. Let him talk to them, let him persuade them to give up privileges in a gradual manner.

So far as the privy purses are concerned, they get automatically reduced at each succession. The Nizam of Hyderabad, who was a traitor to the country, died only recently. He was getting Rs. 50 lakhs annually as privy purse. His successor has been given Rs. twenty lakhs. It could have been reduced further. In this way though privy purses will virtually disappear in the course of time. But I would submit that the problem should not be given the colour that the communists want to give it. They want to create anarchy and



Pakistan, Burma and Communist China. The Chinese have stepped up their activities in North Burma which is adjacent to India since the deterioration in Sino-Burma relations. This area is thus virtually encircled on three sides by hostile States or elements.

Pakistan has had her eyes on Assam from her very inception. At the time of first partition of Bengal by the British in 1904, Assam was linked up with East Bengal to make the whole a Muslim majority area. The British Cabinet Mission again clubbed Assam with Bengal to form a Muslim majority zone in the East. Thanks to the efforts of Shri Gopi Nath Bardolai and the support he got from Mahatma Gandhi, Assam was saved. But Pakistan has persisted in its evil designs on Assam ever since. Mr. Bhutto has openly claimed Assam for Pakistan in an article written by him recently. Pakistan has been making systematic efforts to secure Assam for her ever since 1947.

Muslim population left in Assam in 1947 was just about 10 per cent of its total population. I know the moment I will refer to Muslims, some honourable friends will call me communal. But the time has come when we must face the facts and call spade a spade. The failure to do so will amount to treachery to the nation. I, therefore, do not want to mince words. Thereafter Pakistan began to send Muslims into Assam with a view to increase the Muslim population. As a result the percentage of Muslim population rose to about 25% in 1961 census. How do you explain this steep rise in Muslim population in Assam? I ask.

While on the one hand systematic efforts are being made to augment Muslim population, on the other hand

attempts are being made by Pro-Pak elements to squeeze out non-Muslims from Assam. Apparently the recent outburst in Gauhati was aimed against the people of non-Assami origin. But what is the reality? I personally went to Gauhati and studied the pattern of destruction there with my own eyes. Two shops on this side belonging to Marwari Hindus are completely burnt down as also two shops on the other side belonging to a Bangali Hindus. But a shop lying in between belonging to a Bengali Muslim is not touched at all. A building belonged to a Muslim but its tenant was a Hindu. The building was not touched but all the belongings of the Hindu tenant were taken out and burnt to ashes. I challenge any one to refute these facts, to contradict these facts.

Therefore the plain truth is that while on the one hand Hindus are sought to be driven out of Assam on the ground of being non-Assamese on the other hand Muslim population is being augmented by large scale infiltration and settlement of Pakistani Muslims there.

I would like the Home Minister, Shri Chavan, to take the House in confidence about the reported instruction of the Central Government to Assam Government about granting citizenship to all Muslim immigrants who have been illegally living in Assam for the last five years. On the other hand those who have been living there for centuries are being driven out on the plea of their being non-Assamese. This is a conspiracy to cut off Assam from India. Pro-China elements are collaborating with Pro-Pak elements to achieve this nefarious end. The Pro-West elements represented by Christian missionaries are also active there. All these



anti-Indian elements are actively working for dismembering Assam in their own way.

I would remind the House of what happened in 1962 at the time of Chinese invasion. Pakistan flags were then raised over Tezpur. It was then reported in the Press that Communist China and Pakistan have agreed to partition Assam. The areas to the north of the Brahmaputra will be annexed by China and the area south of it will be taken by Pakistan. They seem to be working on the same plan even now. But now it is being done under the cover of regionalism and students are being utilised for that purpose.

I had met a number of student leaders, Professors and Principals in Gauhati. I can emphatically say that the destruction there was not the work of students. I know the Indian students. They are not unpatriotic. Their name is being used only as a smoke-screen by interested parties and elements. It is time to unmask and isolate such elements as are trying to cut off Assam. The Government must pay due attention to this task.

In fact the policies of the Government of India are responsible to a great extent for this state of affairs in Assam. As has been said before me, the Central Ministers have been making mutually contradictory policy statements. Shri Ashoka Mehta is a Central Minister. He gave one report. Later the Prime Minister visited Assam and said quite a different thing. Was it not their duty to speak with one voice on this question of national importance after due consideration ?

The creation of the separate State of Nagaland has also a significant bearing on the developments in Assam. First, a State with a population of only  $3\frac{1}{2}$  lakhs was

formed. Even after forming that State, the Government continued to negotiate with the rebels. This has had adverse affect on the whole of Assam. The people have begun to feel that if a state of three-lakh population and an annual income of a few lakhs could be carved out of Assam through violent action and maintained by annual subvention of 8 to 10 crores from the Centre, why could not a Mizo State of three lakh population or an Ahom State of 20 lakhs and a Kamatapur State and Kachar State with equal population be formed.

The question of formation of a separate Nagaland had come up in the second Parliament in 1961-62 when I too happened to be a Member of this honourable House. I had then warned the Government that "You are opening flood-gates of disruption" by conceding the demand for Nagaland. I am sorry to say that events have proved every word I then said to be correct. The example of Nagaland is being followed by others.

Acharya Kripalani just now complained about the formation of Shiv Sena and the slogans like Assam for Assamese and Bengal for Bengalis. But how did all this begin ? It began with Kashmir. If Kashmir is to enjoy a special status, if Kashmir is to be for Kashmiris only, if no other Indian can purchase land and get employment there and if Nagaland is only for Nagas and no non-Naga can purchase land there, then how can you blame those who say that Assam is only for the Assamese. We are to blame, the Central Government is to blame in this matter. We cannot have double standards. If we concede that Kashmir is for Kashmiris only, how we can condemn Shiv Sena for saying that Maharashtra is for Maharashtrians. Therefore, I submit that we must go to the root of this problem.



In this context I would like to make a few concrete suggestions and would request the House to consider them seriously.

In the first place, in view of the strategic situation of Assam and the fact of its encirclement on three sides by hostile States, any scheme of reorganisation of this State must give top consideration to the security aspect of the problem. It should not be tackled piecemeal on party lines. I would suggest that a Defence-oriented Commission consisting of some military experts and persons of national status should be set up to go into the question of re-organisation of the entire Eastern region including Assam, Manipur, Tripura, Nagaland and NEFA. This Commission should give due weight to local aspirations and economic development of different regions while giving top priority to defence needs of the country. The whole region should be re-organised on the basis of the report of such a Commission. It is wrong to appoint one Committee after the other to go into the question piecemeal.

Secondly, the continuous infiltration of Muslims from Pakistan must be checked. Shri G.L. Nanda, when he was the Home Minister, had prepared a plan to clear a one-mile belt of territory along the border of all population so that infiltration of Pakistanis could be effectively checked. But that plan has not been implemented so far. This plan must be put into operation expeditiously so that illegal infiltration of Pakistan nationals may be stopped. Such people as can be an effective check on infiltrators and trespassers should be settled in such a depopulated belt. The danger to national security will continue till this is done.

Thirdly, all the foreign missions operating in Nagaland and other hill areas of Assam should be expelled. The missionaries have been functioning in such a way as to create pockets for the Western Powers in this strategic area.

To remove the sense of insecurity that has grown in Assam and other border areas, the Central Government must act firmly and effectively. To say that this is a border area is no excuse for Government's inaction. The whole history of the world is a testimony to the fact that wherever there are hostile States on the other side of the border of a State, they try to keep the border area in ferment. The remedy for such a situation is not withdrawal but firm handling of the rebellious elements. Indecision or escapism only make things worse. More effective control and not abdication of authority is needed in the trouble spots on the border. The Central control on such areas must be tightened. Wherever the Centre has a special responsibility that must be made a Centrally-administered area. The strength of Central Reserve Police in such areas must be increased. The recent happenings in Assam have demoralised the people, their confidence has been shaken. Steps must be taken to restore their confidence in the Government.

It is the elementary duty of the Government that it should ensure security of life and property to all law-abiding citizens. But the Government have failed to discharge this duty in Assam. It is, therefore, its obligation to compensate the people who have suffered because of its failure to do its job. Those who are well off or have something to fall back upon should be rehabilitated by Central grant of interest-free loans. But the



poor like Rikshawalas, who mainly come from Bihar, should be compensated in full for the loss suffered by them.

Finally, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the one lesson of Indian history, namely, whenever the Central Government in India became weak, the separatist forces raised their head on the borders and process of disintegration of the country began. Whatever you may think about yourself, the impression has grown in the country that the present Central Government is weak. Therefore, you alone cannot provide the remedy for this malady. It has, therefore, become imperative that you must sit down with others and think out ways and means of meeting present situation.

I am not one of those who want Central Government to be weak. I would like the Central Government, whether it is run by you or me, to be strong and effective. The Centre must be powerful. That is why my Party has been demanding a unitary form of Government. The Central Government must meet the challenge of the disruptive forces and save Assam which has become a den of such elements. I would, therefore, submit that these suggestions should be given a cool and calm consideration.

# Security and Secularism

[Speech delivered in Lok Sabha on 8. 1. 1968]

I welcome this Bill which has been brought before the House to give a legal shape to the Border Security Force which has been in existence for some time. The credit for creating this Force must go to our former Home Minister, Shri G.L. Nanda, for which he deserves congratulations. Till this Force was created the responsibility of border security was entrusted to a number of police detachments, which were controlled by respective State Governments but whose expenses were met by the Centre. As a result there was no uniformity either in regard to training or equipment. Since defence is the responsibility of the Central Government, it is good that it has created one integrated force for the whole country for this purpose under its direct control and supervision. But let us be clear in our minds that creation of a Border Security Force in itself is not going to ensure our security. We already have our armed forces. But, according to Indo-Pak agreement, they are not to be kept on the border in peace time. So in peace time the job of peace-keeping on the border has to be done by some other force. Such a force will have to act as first line of defence in peace time and second line of defence in war time, but in the ultimate analysis the security of a country depends on a number of factors and not on security forces alone.



The first factor is the attitude of the country or countries across the border and the state of their military preparedness. The second is the terrain and the general geographical position of the border area. Third factor is the complexion and character of the people living on the border on either side. The state of communications including the available transport is the fourth factor and fifth is the numerical strength, training and equipment of the respective border security forces. A proper study and assessment of all these factors needs to be made when considering the question of defence of the borders of any country. We will have to co-ordinate and correlate the position in regard to all these five factors which together will determine our capability to defend our borders. The creation of a Border Security Force itself is not enough.

Our land frontier is about five thousand miles long. Only a part of it runs along Nepal and Burma which are friendly to us. But a very large part of our border runs along Pakistan, which is our born enemy, and Communist China, which is India's natural rival in Asia. Therefore, while considering the question of border security we have to pay special attention to Pakistan which has already aggressed against our country four times during the last twenty years.

So far as Pakistan is concerned her terrain and geographical position is similar to that of India. Therefore it is no use repeating again and again that we have not been able to tackle this problem or that because of the difficult terrain. There are many other countries like Malaysia and Thailand which have similar terrain and still have successfully tackled similar border pro-

blems. So far as Rajasthan border is concerned it has desert conditions on both sides.

So far as the question of the people living in the border areas is concerned, Pakistan can fully depend on the people living on her side of the border. They are fanatically anti-Indian. Hindus and other non-Muslims whose loyalty could be suspect in her eyes have been squeezed out or removed scores of miles away from the border. But we have failed to do anything of the type in our border areas.

We did make a number of plans. Shri G.L. Nanda prepared a scheme to clear one-mile belt along Assam East Pakistan border of all population to prevent Pakistani infiltration. It was a good scheme and was in the best interests of national security. But nothing has been done to put it in operation so far. A plan had been made to make available a five-mile-wide belt along the Indo-Pakistan border in the area served by the Rajasthan Canal to the Ministry of Defence for resettlement of ex-soldiers. But I learn that Rajasthan Government has gone back on that commitment. The reason to back out was the desire to get the votes of the elements of doubtful loyalty living there.

I would like to appeal to the Home Minister to remember that he is not only a Congressman, he is also the Home Minister of India. He should, therefore, see to it that Pakistan whose bellicosity has increased because of the massive supply of arms—she first got these free arms from America, then from China and now she is getting them from Soviet Union as well—does not make another adventure. We cannot afford to take any risk or chance where the security of the country is involved.



It would be wrong to bring in the question of secularism in such matters. We, in fact, do not even know the exact meaning of secularism. I would very much wish that our friends opposite consult some dictionary or encyclopaedia to find out what secularism means. Our State today is not a secular State. Ours is a communal State working in favour of a particular minority community. Such a State cannot be called a secular State. Is there any other State in the world which claims to be secular but which has different sets of civil laws for different religions/communities ? That is why I repeat that ours is not a Secular State at present. Let us not deceive ourselves and others in this matter. I do want India to be a Secular State in the true sense of the term. In fact Bhartiya State, the Hindu State, has always been secular. There is only one exception to it in our entire history as a free country. That exception is Asoka. He fell from the Hindu ideal of Secular State and misused the resources and influence of the State for the propagation of Buddhism. That was one major factor in the downfall of Mauryan Empire. Chhatrapati Shivaji was a secular King. Maharaja Ranjeet Singh was a secular King. But it is a strange irony that the model of this so-called Secular State is Asoka, the only non-secular king of our history and not Shivaji or Ranjeet Singh. I would like you to make this country truly secular so that you may have the cooperation and support of people like me as well. I am clear in my mind that no Hindu can be non-secular. Hindu culture and thought is the one guarantee of secularism in the world. This is part of our life and tradition. India can and will remain secular so long as it follows and cherishes that culture,

thought and tradition.

But we should be clear about one thing. If there is a clash between secularism or any other ism and the demands of security of the country, then security must get the first priority. If there is clash between secularism and security or constitutionalism and security or democracy and security, then secularism, constitutionalism and democracy must go to the wall and security must come first. There can be no two opinions in this matter.

Therefore, while considering the question of the security of our borders, this aspect of the problem cannot be ignored. If there are any people in the border areas whose loyalty to the country is doubtful, they will have to be removed from there with a firm hand and while doing so we should not bother as to what some people may think about us.

I know that some people will call me communal for saying all this. But I am not bothered about that. I am a nationalist. Whatever I say, I say in the wider interests of the country. Therefore, I am not worried by what some people say about me.

I would appeal to the Home Minister to realise the dangers that beset the unity and security of our country today. Our economic problem is not a very serious problem. Today we are poor, tomorrow we can get rich; today there is shortage of food, tomorrow we can have more of it. But where shall we be if we lose our unity, if our security continues to be threatened. I would therefore submit that where the unity and security of the country is at stake we must think with one mind and our thinking should be realistic. Our model in this



respect should be late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. Let us follow him. I would urge upon the Home Minister, Shri Chavan, to follow on the foot-steps of Sardar Patel.

The thing that comes second only to the need for removal of people of doubtful loyalties from the border area is the question of transportation and communication facilities in the border area. Pakistan has built a network of roads along its border. She has constructed new strategic roads and railway lines and she has a superior tele-communication system there. The trucks being used by her in the border areas have a special kind of tyres suited to the desert areas,

Comparatively speaking our communication system is not so good. I have been to the border areas and have discussed these matters with Jawans and Officers of Border Security Force on the spot. They are worried that their communications and their mobility are not as good as those of their counter-parts in Pakistan. Therefore this question of transportation and communications must receive immediate attention.

The numerical strength, training and equipment of the Border Security Force also deserve careful thought. I hold that the numerical strength of our Border Security Force is not sufficient. I was reminded of this fact at different places. Everybody stressed the need for increasing numerical strength of the Border Security Force.

So far as training and equipment are concerned till recently Pakistani counter-parts, which are called by Pakistan as "rangers" were in a better position. Of late we have made some improvement in this regard.

But much remains to be done yet. All these things deserve careful consideration. In matters of equipment and training we must bring Border Security Force to the level of regular armed forces.

In fact it would be wrong to mix up the Border Security Force with Police Force. I am glad that the Home Minister has himself said that in the matter of equipment and training B.S.F. should be at par with the regular armed forces. It should be kept so in other matters as well. It is also important that permanent living quarters for Border Security Force are constructed near the border areas. At present Officers and Jawans of this Force mainly live in tents. While it is true that many will have to live in tents at many places, steps should be taken to set up some permanent cantonements for them. Some training centres will also have to be set up for training them. The best thing would be to mainly draw upon army personnel for this purpose. Some of the Emergency Officers who have been released recently have been absorbed in Border Security Force. More can be absorbed. Similarly some of the ex-soldiers can be taken into this Force.

This force can be much more effective and useful if the local people of the various border areas get into it in larger numbers. Dogras of Jammu and Rajputs of Rajasthan and such other local people who know the terrain and geography of the areas concerned can have a better liaison with the civilian population of the areas and therefore, can be more effective. Recently when I visited Chhad-Bet in the Rann of Kutch I found two companies of the Border Security Force stationed there. I enquired of them whether there were any jawans from Gujrat State among them. But I was surprised to know that



some of them hailed from Punjab and Haryana and others from Madhya Pradesh but none from Gujrat. Today there is greater danger of aggression from across Rajasthan and Gujrat borders. The soldiers hailing from these areas will naturally feel greater concern about the security of their home areas. This does not mean that others do not feel the pinch. Our people in general are patriots. But the local people have greater stake and, therefore, feel more concerned about the security of their borders.

This aspect of the problem has assumed greater importance because of the new developments and problems facing the border areas. On July 7, 1968 *Hong Kong Standard* of Hong Kong published an article by Robert Dickson Crane of the Hudson Institute, New York. He claims to have lived for some time in Nagaland and North Burma and met the leaders of rebel elements there. This article, which bears the caption "The Next War in Asia", says that a new war is coming in Asia, and the people behind it have the support of Communist China. Mr. Crane has advised the American Government through this article not to oppose the Naga rebels so that they may not go China completely. He calls the rebellions of Nagas in India and Shans in Burma as national movements of liberation. Thus a dangerous situation is developing in the Eastern region which may be exploited by Communist China to wage a war on the Vietnamese model.

The situation in Kashmir has become still more serious. The *Pakistan Observer* of Dacca which used to be lukewarm regarding Pakistan, claims on Kashmir recently came out with an editorial which said that Sheikh

Abdullah is no longer committed to non-violence and that he is now prepared to lead a violent movement. This significant comment, viewed in the background of Sheikh Abdullah's own statement, Pakistan's warlike preparations including training in guerilla warfare to the people in the border areas points to impending trouble in Kashmir as also in the North Eastern region. Therefore there is need for alertness both on political as well as on military plane. History will not forgive us if we fail to take all these necessary steps in time.

---





